Published on the 15th of the month.

Vol. XVI, Nos. 2 & 3. MAY & JUNE, 1926.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
In Memoriam—Canon M. G. Glazebrook ..	57
Signs of the Times:	
A Plea for Greater Dogmatic Freedom ..	59
Modernism as a Refuge and Dynamic ..	61
The Dangers of Modernism	63
Free Churchmen and Modern Churchmen ..	64
Cult or Craze?	65
The E.C.U. and the Appointment of Bishops	66
The Great Itinerant .. .. C. J. Wright, B.D.	69
A Biologist's Opinion of Birth Control .. .. Professor Julian S. Huxley.	77
New Testament Criticism and the Person of Jesus Christ. H. Kenneth Luce, M.A.	87
The Principle of English Modernism .. .. The Editor.	97
St. Paul's Thorn in the Flesh .. .. .. R. V. G. Tasker, M.A.	104
The Present State of Old Testament Study .. F. L. Cross, M.A., B.Sc.	117
The World Call to the Church .. .. .. Archdeacon Beresford Potter.	129
Book Reviews	134
Correspondence	153

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

AGENTS: SOUTH AFRICA—T. MASKEW MILLER, Cape Town.
AUSTRALASIA—GEO. HICKS, 54 Victoria Street, Wellington.
UNITED STATES—ARTHUR BRENTANO, New York.

Price 2/- net. (Annual Subscription, 10/6.)

Cadbury means Quality

SEE THE NAME Cadbury ON EVERY PIECE OF CHOCOLATE.

Two Popular Hotels in Central London.

NEAR THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

KINGSLEY HOTEL

Hart Street, Bloomsbury Square, LONDON, W.C.1.

OPPOSITE THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

THACKERAY HOTEL

Great Russell Street, LONDON, W.C.1.

These Large and Well-appointed Temperance Hotels have Passenger Lifts.
Bath-rooms on every Floor.
Lounges and Spacious Dining, Drawing, Writing, Reading, Billiard and Smoking Rooms.

Bedroom, Breakfast and Attendance, from 8/6 per Night.

FULL TARIFF AND TESTIMONIALS ON APPLICATION.

Telegraphic Address —

KINGSLEY HOTEL: **'Bookcraft, London.'**

THACKERAY HOTEL: **'Thackeray, London.'**

Telephones:—

Museum 1232 (2 lines). **Museum 1230 (2 lines).**

RIPON HALL, OXFORD.

(Founded by Bishop Boyd Carpenter, D.D., D.C.L., K.C.V.O., at Ripon in 1898, moved to Oxford in 1919.)

Warden: The Right Rev. T. B. STRONG, D.D., Mus.D., D.Litt., G.B.E., Lord Bishop of Oxford.

Principal: **Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR. M.A., D.D.**

Vice-Principal: **Rev. J. S. BEZZANT, M.A.**

Tutor: F. L. CROSS, M.A., B.Sc.

RIPON HALL is a Graduate Theological College designed to afford a training on modern lines to candidates for Holy Orders in any diocese of the Anglican Communion.

Full particulars of the Course, Fees, Exhibitions, etc., can be had on application to the Principal, Ripon Hall, Oxford.

Laymen who desire a broad-minded, sympathetic, and well-educated Clergy can materially assist this end by contributing to the Exhibition Fund of Ripon Hall.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*
A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Nos. 2 & 3. MAY & JUNE, 1926. Vol. XVI.

IN MEMORIAM

MICHAEL GEORGE GLAZEBROOK

(1853—1926)

WITH deep regret we record the loss to our cause sustained by the death of Canon Glazebrook on May 1st. He was an outstanding figure in the English educational world, in which after a brilliant scholastic and athletic career at Balliol College, Oxford, he became successively a master of Harrow, High Master of Manchester, and Head Master of Clifton. From the last he retired in 1905 to become Canon of Ely, and in 1907—1911 delivered the Warburton Lectures at Lincoln's Inn. At Harrow he began by editing Greek plays, but passed later to the study of the Old Testament, and produced three useful volumes, *Lessons from the Old Testament* (1890), *Studies in the Book of Isaiah* (1910), *The End of the Law* (1912).

A theological and political Liberal, a friend of Canon Barnett and his wife, and a firm believer in their methods of social reform, it was natural that he should join the Churchmen's Union. He became a member of its Council nearly twenty years ago, when under the presidency of the Rev. A. W. Hutton, the biographer of Manning and Newman, it met in the old Vestry Hall of Bow Church. After Hutton's death, Glazebrook became Chairman of the Council, and in this position he was a tower of strength to the society. Punctuality, thoroughness, courtesy and decision marked his leadership.

When it was resolved to begin the publication of the Modern Churchman's Library, he wrote the first and most successful volume of the series entitled *The Faith of a Modern Churchman.* It appeared in 1918, was reprinted the same year and translated into French. A second and enlarged edition has just been issued by Mr. Murray. Dr. Chase, Bishop of Ely, felt called upon to condemn it publicly, and a long controversy ensued. Canon Glazebrook's final reply appeared in a little volume, *The Letter and the Spirit.* His last published book was *The Apocalypse of St. John,* an attempt to set forth in simple fashion the conclusions which our scholars, and especially Dr. R. H. Charles, have reached about the purpose, character, and message of this most incomprehensible of books to the uninstructed.

When the Ripon Clergy College was moved up to Oxford in 1919 and re-opened as Ripon Hall, Canon Glazebrook became both Chairman of the Council and Treasurer of the Corporation, and in both capacities he served it ably and self-sacrificingly.

He took an active part in the annual Modern Churchmen's Conferences, which owed much to his conscientious preparation and dignified presidency. Refined, cultured, impartial, sarcastic, he constituted an invaluable element in the gatherings of our *corpus permixtum.* Beneath his headmaster's manner he concealed a sensitive, generous, and tender heart. Of late years, both he and Mrs. Glazebrook suffered much from ill-health. Nevertheless, he patiently and conscientiously laboured on to the end in the spirit of Matthew Arnold's lines :

> 'With aching hands and bleeding feet
> We dig and heap, lay stone on stone;
> We bear the burden and the heat
> Of the long day, and wish 'twere done.
> Not till the hours of light return
> All we have built do we discern.'

On May 5th, after a very beautiful service in the glorious Ely Minster, in the bright spring sunlight, amid the perplexity of civil strife and national calamity, his body was laid to rest. Whether it be that in his case the righteous are taken away from the evil to come who shall say; certain it is that the nation, the Church, and the Modernist cause are the weaker for his departure.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

A Plea for Greater Dogmatic Freedom.

The following significant letter, signed by four graduate ordinands of the University of Oxford, was published recently in the *Manchester Guardian* and *Oxford Magazine*:

SIR,

There is a wide-spread opinion that the Church is committed to literal acceptance of all the traditional orthodox formulae. There is also an idea among many of the laity that no one without such acceptance can honestly take orders in the Church. So long as this suspicion lasts, there can be no cure, either for the drift of many thinking men and women from the Church, or for that shortage of ordinands, which the authorities of the Church deplore. We, therefore, think that the time has come to appeal for a definite change of the official attitude of the Church, in regard to doctrinal formulae.

The Christian Gospel is too big a thing to be expressed in any set of formulae. It is a Way, a Creed of Life; it calls all men and women to the service of Christ, Who, by His Life and Death, wills all men to be His Sons, and calls them to Life Immortal. The Creeds are traditional expressions of this Christian Gospel, but we do not think their recitation as such involves literal assent to all their details. In particular we hold that no specific assent should be demanded from clergy or laity to the Virgin-Birth or to a physical interpretation of the Resurrection.

Many think it to be dishonest for any who hold the above views to be active lay members of the Church or to enter the ministry. For these reasons it seems to us vital, not only that the Prayer Book Services should be reformed, but that authority should at once make it clear that it is possible honestly and openly to be members of the Church and to serve in the ministry on this basis.

The general position outlined above has been publicly maintained by a number of clergy and representative laity; but we believe that the general public has no idea of the extent to which this is the case. We therefore venture to appeal to like-minded Churchmen to take every opportunity at this time of affirming their convictions.

It is because we ourselves are young men who seek ordination, and who believe that the Life and Teaching of Christ constitute the vital Gospel most needed for our age, that we feel impelled to call upon the Church to face this issue, in the hope that it may be made easier for the many who we know share our ideals to give their lives to the service of Christ in the ministry of the Church.

We are, etc.,

G. F. ALLEN, University College, Oxford.
M. T. DUNLOP, Hertford College, Oxford.
R. MCKAY, Magdalen College, Oxford.
H. G. R. SELLON, University College, Oxford.

For some years past it has been only too clear that not only the number, but also the intellectual quality, of our ordinands has

declined, and that this has been due in no small measure to the increasing difficulty experienced by our better educated young men in accepting our dogmatic formularies in their traditional sense. The Subscription Act of 1865 relieved the consciences of the older Broad Church clergy and their immediate successors; but it does not relieve the consciences of would-be ordinands to-day in the face of constant attacks made on Modernist honesty. This has created a very serious situation, for among these men are some of the very best, and the Church can ill afford to lose their services.

If the Church can find the money for their education she can produce a numerous priesthood of the sacristan or acolyte type, but such a priesthood is not going to carry much weight in a modern English community. To whom is such a priesthood to minister? It may be replied: 'They will minister to the humble poor.' If this mean the labouring and artizan population, it is not correct. If it mean the charcoal-burners, *i.e.* the religious of every class for whom the traditional faith is quite unaffected by modern knowledge, we admit that it is correct, but would point out that they are a rapidly-diminishing body. The new proletariat and the *nouveaux riches* are the people the Church requires to win, and a seminarist clergy drawn from *la petite bourgeoisie* will carry little weight with them. Frankly let it be said that while the Church ought to have a place for men of every class in her ministry, she will certainly lose her grip on the national life if she cannot draw the bulk of her clergy from the best of the professional and mercantile classes. In the English Church the personality of the clergyman counts greatly: in the Greek and Roman communions the man is submerged in the official. The man of docile mind who is almost as incapable of doubting as he is of thinking must count for little as a teacher of Christian truth to Englishmen in this age. From what we know of ordinands we should have far less hesitation in ordaining those who cannot give a literal adhesion to our formularies than those who can. The tendency of the clerical life is to narrow the mind even though it be to soften the heart. It is a good thing for the ordinand to begin by being a good deal broader than the formularies, provided that he have a single-minded desire to serve Christ in the ministry of His Church; for even though he begin his clerical life 'in a large

room,' he may easily find himself at the end of it standing upon 'a pin-point of the truth.' When the Dean and Canons of Westminster are admitted to their office, they take an oath to 'prefer Scripture to tradition, and what is true to what is accepted' (*Deo teste promitto ac spondeo me . . . vera consuetis, scripta non scriptis, in religionis causa antehabiturum*). That is the vow we could wish that every ordinand should register, if not with his lips, at least in his heart, for it is only men of that spirit who can and will win to Christ the understanding and whole-hearted loyalty of the English people.

Several years ago the Archbishops appointed a committee to investigate the Anglican dogmatic formularies with a view to making such modifications as the modern situation necessitated. We devoutly hope that the committee will present their report in time to have their findings incorporated into the Ordinal of the revised Prayer-Book. The need is urgent and opportunity is fleeting. It will be a dark day—and it is fast approaching unless steps be taken by our authorities to prevent it—when the modern-minded educated Englishman will feel, in choosing his career, that a life of Christian service in Holy Orders is not worth serious consideration.

Modernism as a Refuge and Dynamic.

The *London Quarterly Review* for April contains a contribution by Dr. Frank Ballard, the Christian apologist, on 'Modernism as a Refuge and Dynamic.' Dr. Ballard is of opinion that there is to-day only a choice between three forms of Christian faith, Fundamentalism, Romanism, Modernism. 'Liberal Evangelicalism,' he rightly remarks, 'is simply Evangelical Modernism.' Many English Churchmen will feel that Dr. Ballard ought to have provided a fourth option, Catholicism, but he does not, neither does he tell us why he does not. It may be that he is of opinion that the positive elements in Catholicism, where they can be combined with the positive elements in Protestantism, and the positive contributions of our modern knowledge and experience, are all rightly comprehended in Modernism, and that Romanism is merely the residuum of Catholicism after the completion of this process of extraction.

Or it may be that he is of opinion that Romanism is Catholicism worked out to its logical conclusion; in other words, that Romanism is a vital evolving Catholicism; and that Catholicism, as we know it in England, is merely an academic and artificial product possessed of no real stability or cohesive unity.

Certainly for all practical purposes the distinction between Catholicism and Romanism is fast disappearing, although that distinction was a very real one for many English Churchmen. To-day we see English Catholicism splitting up into Romanism and Modernism, and English Modernism, which formerly consisted mainly of Liberal Protestants, now including a number of those who until recently were strong Anglo-Catholics. As for Greek Orthodoxy, Dr. Ballard probably regards it as a static or petrified Catholicism, just as Renan defined Mohammedanism as petrified Judaism. These considerations seem to justify Dr. Ballard's rather novel threefold religious option.

Dr. Ballard himself, who was formerly a strong Traditionalist, is now an enthusiastic Modernist. Modernism, he affirms, 'provokes to reality,' 'stirs to life.' 'It stimulates to the fullest use of all our faculties in its definite acknowledgment that for all believers, and for all Churches, there is yet much to be learned and unlearned.' 'Modernism enables all real Christians to work together for the common good, in spite of differing convictions and ideals . . . thus it becomes the only hope for a really united Christendom.' 'It makes room for that further growth of faith, which comes through increasing knowledge of God.'

Dr. Ballard's definition of Modernism is worth citing:

> 'Its simplest yet sufficient definition is *open-mindedness*. But, in fuller expression, it is just what the Apostle said with such emphasis in his letter to the Philippians: "In one last word, brothers, whatever is true or honourable, just or pure, winsome or promising, if there is anything noble or praiseworthy, take all these into full account." Thus Modernism represents the thought and effort of those who see the prevalent corrosion of faith through the modern atmosphere, and endeavour to prevent or mitigate it on behalf of real Christianity.'

Dr. Ballard quotes with keen appreciation the words of Maurice Pryke:

> 'Apart from Modernism, Christianity has no future, since without that unification of religion with modern thought for which the Modernist is working, the gulf between the Churches and the man in the street must grow continually wider, until at length religion and obscurantism become interchangeable terms, and that unhappy identification of faith with credulity, towards which many now appear to be moving, shall have attained completion.'

The Dangers of Modernism.

Dr. Fosdick, who may justly be described as the leading Modernist in America, has contributed a useful article to the March *Harper's Magazine* on 'The Dangers of Modernism.'

He begins by pointing out that the modernist feels acutely the danger of divorcing religion from intelligence, because he recognizes that this divorce would prove fatal to religion:

> 'The application of historical methods to the understanding of the Bible, painstaking, unprejudiced research into the development of Christianity and its institutions, the sympathetic study of other religions, hospitality to modern science even when that means discarding old forms of thought, the restatement of religious experience in terms of new views of the world, the endeavour to apply Christian principles to contemporary social situations—all these typical activities of modernism spring from the desire to preserve a cordial alliance between religion and intelligence.'

And Dr. Fosdick adds, 'that this alliance is to be fought for, if we are not to lose it, seems clear.' But a very real danger assails the modernist in his endeavours on this behalf. By giving so much study and energy to the intellectual understanding and presentation of religion he may come almost imperceptibly to himself to regard religion as mainly an intellectual thing instead of being in its essence fellowship with God. A modernism which seeks merely to become intelligent rather than spiritual will cease to be a religious force.

The second danger to modernism arises from its contempt for the chaotic condition of the Christian world, contempt especially for its pathetic and ridiculous schisms.

> 'Not all who feel the shame of this situation are modernists, but all modernists feel the shame of this situation. It is one of the characteristic marks of modernism to care little or nothing for present denominational divisions, to think them negligible, even contemptible, to wonder how intelligent people can be excited over them when such tremendous issues face Christian thought and such challenging causes call for Christian loyalty.'

Now this spirit may make the modernist himself a schismatic. It may lead him to separate himself from his Christian brethren, not by deliberately fomenting a new schism, but by quietly withdrawing from Christian organized life as incapable of or indifferent to courageous reform. He gives up organized Christianity in despair and washes his hands of its follies. This is a very easy thing to do, but by doing it he is not only playing into the hands of the obscurantists, he is also condemning modernism to aridity. To secure a united Christianity it is

first necessary to secure an enlightened Christianity, and this is a very hard and laborious educational process. It demands much effort, much sympathy, much patience, and close and constant association with one's fellow Christians. There is much good in every religious denomination. Its separateness is due in many cases to its desire to emphasize a neglected aspect of Christian truth : it is a home of devout, even if in some measure misguided, souls. What it needs is not to be destroyed but developed, and it is the duty of the modernist in that denomination to labour at this development by working within the denomination usefully and self-sacrificingly. He need not be blind to its faults; indeed, he most certainly ought not to be, but he should be sympathetic to its virtues. This brings out the other need in modernism : fellowship with God must be united to fellowship with man, especially with one's fellow-Christian, if modernism is not to become an arid liberalism.

Free Churchmen and Modern Churchmen.

The *Congregational Quarterly* for April contains an interesting and significant article by Dr. R. F. Horton, the Free Church leader, in which he deals with the labours and teaching of Modern Churchmen in a very sympathetic spirit. He believes that they are setting an example which Free Churchmen would do well to copy, he also believes that in the Free Churches there can be found a more congenial sphere for their endeavours than in the Church of England. This remains to be seen. The Anglican Communion is not really as hide-bound as it seems. Its solid front of Traditionalism is giving way on both flanks and would yield even more quickly than it is doing if its protagonists were not so afraid of their fellow-soldiers. Dr. Horton asks :

> 'Cannot the Free Churches be called to this their proper task? They may learn from these brave and fearless Modern Churchmen; they may aid them in their task; they may give to our perplexed and doubting age even greater help than the Modern Churchmen can give. They can strike out more fearlessly; they can offer a more unreserved loyalty to truth, wherever truth may lead. There is nothing to hinder the Free Churches from starting afresh, as the first apostles did, from Christ as He was shown to men, so surely Man, so unmistakably God. They are not committed to the authoritative explanations of the Councils. They may interpret the unique Person in the light of our present-day psychology, and in full view of the results of comparative religion. There is nothing to hinder them from adopting unreservedly Christ's view of God, from ruling out ancient beliefs or latter-day superstitions

which are inconsistent with it. They can take Christ as the interpreter of Scripture rather than Scripture as the authority for Christ. They can accept science as, next to Christ, the surest revelation of God. They can learn from history, especially Church history, without being limited by it.'

We are glad to note that Dr. Horton does not stop short with inspiring generalities and glowing ideals, he concludes by asking a practical question:

'Who will call the Conference of Modern Free Churchmen to fulfil their prescribed task? Would Professor Peake, and Principals Garvie and Selbie, add thus to their many and constant services? Would they call a Modern Free Churchmen's Conference to work side by side with the Modern Churchmen, until the good day dawns when they can work hand in hand and heart to heart?'

We hope indeed that they will, and so open the way to a co-operation and an inter-communion in which both heart and head can unite.

Cult or Craze?

As the *St. Martin's Review* is undoubtedly the best of our parish magazines, so the *Diocese of Liverpool Review*,[1] the first number of which appeared in April, 1926, promises to be the best of our diocesan organs. It breathes the new spirit, and yet not new, but old, for it is essentially Christian. Nevertheless, it is not the spirit of primitive Christianity which inspires it. Its outlook is neither eschatological nor other-worldly: it is deeply interested in present-day tasks and local problems such as the elimination of slums from Liverpool; the uniting of idealistic youth and disillusioned age in the happy fellowship of Christian service; the needs and opportunities of present-day foreign missions.

Of many stimulating articles, the one which impresses us most is 'Cult or Craze? Plain Words on Psycho-Analysis,' by Canon Raven. Whilst he speaks respectfully of the great-hearted and level-headed psycho-therapists, 'that group of fine and gracious personalities' who have brought health to many twisted and afflicted lives, he finds it hard to speak with patience of the deadly harm which unrestricted Freudian propaganda is accomplishing, especially in the case of the morals of the young.

'Freudianism,' he writes, 'simply sanctions and perpetuates the tendency to pruriency which most normal people have little difficulty in overcoming by other and healthier interests.'

[1] Published at 1 South John Street, Liverpool; price 6*d*.

It has led to an outbreak of charlatanism.

> 'Certain it is that psycho-therapists of all sorts have sprung up like toadstools; that many are wholly unqualified; and that the public has a right to have its health protected against them.'

Of Freud, whom he regards as a victim of egoism and sex-obsession, Canon Raven writes:

> 'Whether the recently-translated life of Freud, to which its subject gives a prefatory blessing, be a piece of naïve and ingenuous flattery or of subtle and successful irony, its effect is the same. No one can read the history of the development of Freudianism without an alternate sense of irritation and melancholy—irritation that such monstrous claims are based on so miserable a foundation, melancholy that a man who ought to be treated as a case of morbid sexuality should have been encouraged to reveal to the world the progress of his disease. In breaking away from the materialism of a mechanistic neurology, Freud achieved a claim to greatness. In an evil hour he set himself, like the physicists of ancient Ionia, to reduce all the complexity of life to a single element. Thales chose water, Anaximander air, Freud sex. And with that selection Freud plunged into dreamland. "Every dream is to be interpreted in terms of Phallic symbolism": common-sense gasps.'

We once listened to a Machiavellian ecclesiastic, who said: 'Do not hit at a vice when it is at its height: you do no good by such action, but only harm to yourself: when a vice first shows its head, and when it is getting past its prime, then hit it, and hit it very hard.'

We hope that Dr. Raven has chosen the right occasion for his laudable assault.

The E.C.U. and the Appointment of Bishops.

The Report on the Appointment of Bishops communicated to the Committee of the Church Assembly by the Council of the English Church Union deserves serious study, for it contains not only a scholarly and judicious exposition of the objections which thoughtful Anglo-Catholics feel to lie against the present method of appointing bishops, but also certain very interesting practical proposals.

The Report is of opinion that, for more than a century after the death of St. Peter and St. Paul, Church tradition gives no clear indication of the method by which men were chosen to fill the episcopal office. Such evidence as exists points, we believe, to the election of the bishops by the *plebs Dei*, the laity of the diocese or parish, as it was called in those days.[1] Gradually

[1] See Harnack's *Constitution and Law of the Church*, p. 110 and references.

this right was limited in various ways, *e.g.*, by the metropolitans and bishops of the province, by the State, by the capitular clergy. As the report rightly indicates :

> 'The custom at Rome, near the beginning of the third century, is shown by the so-called *Egyptian Church Order* (which is really a Roman document), where it is directed that the Bishop is to be chosen by the whole people, and that after this choice and the subsequent assent of the Bishops, presbyters and people, gathered together, he is to be consecrated.'

In the fourth century the Church authorities were convinced that episcopal elections should not be left to the multitude. Hence the choice of the bishop by the people, and even the assent of the people, soon disappeared in the East, and later in the West.

In England before the Conquest the normal method of appointment was by the King and his Council. After the Conquest the Crown nominated, the Chapter elected, and the Metropolitan confirmed. Later the Pope usurped the Metropolitan's part. Henry VIII abolished the Papal confirmation and required the Chapter to elect the person named in the *congé d'élire* 'under pains of praemunire.'

Royal rights in episcopal elections have been widely recognized from the fourth century. Even in recent years the Papacy has conceded such rights to Austria, Bavaria, Spain, Portugal and Peru, and the Report states that the code of the Latin Canon Law now in force recognizes 'election, presentation, or designation even by a civil government.'

The practical conclusion of the historic survey by the Report is moderate and judicious. It runs thus :

> 'What is practically important is to secure that any form of nomination by a ruler is not independent of proper action by (1) the lay members of the Church in the diocese concerned; (2) the clergy of the diocese; and (3) the Bishops of the province with their Metropolitan.'

The Report proposes that Electoral Colleges shall be constituted in every diocese. These Colleges shall include the Chapter and the Archdeacons and a number of elected clerical and lay representatives, these clerical representatives being elected by the diocesan clergy as a whole, the lay representatives by the laity of the Diocesan Conference. The clerical and lay members of the Electoral College to be equal in number.

The Report proposes the retention of the *congé d'élire*, but that it should be exercised by the Sovereign personally, and that either three names be sent with it, of whom one must be elected, or else that the *congé d'élire* require the Electoral College to submit three names, one of whom the Sovereign will personally select for election.

There are difficulties about these proposals.

(1) The close connection between the Sovereign and episcopate proved detrimental to both Crown and Church in Stuart times. On the other hand, the Sovereign is the chief layman of the English Church, and many who do not favour the nomination of Bishops by a Prime Minister who may not be a Churchman would see no objection to the Sovereign nominating. Nomination by the Prime Minister makes for a more diversified episcopate, which is a consideration in its favour.

(2) In the E.C.U. plan the laity elected by a very narrow lay constituency would not represent lay feeling generally. On the other hand, if the Sovereign nominated the three candidates this would increase the lay influence in the election of the Bishop.

Those who have experience of the English Church at home and abroad will feel that there is much to be said for retaining our present system as it is, especially in the face of the acute party feeling which exists within the Church to-day. Our present system saves us from the the turmoil of episcopal elections and provides us with a diversified and gifted episcopate. Those who believe in Edmund Burke's political philosophy will judge a system by its practical results, not by whether it harmonizes with some abstract theory of spiritual freedom. For us spiritual freedom is guaranteed, not by the way our rulers are selected, but by the constitution they administer and the character of the administrators themselves. The proposals of the E.C.U. do not seem to promise anything better than what we have got already, and might lead to something a great deal worse.

THE GREAT ITINERANT

AN OXFORD BI-CENTENARY

By the Reverend C. J. Wright, B.D.

ON March 17th, 1726, John Wesley was elected a Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford. 'Sometime Fellow of Lincoln College' is the familiar designation on the title page of most of his books. The bi-centenary of the election was recently commemorated in a fitting manner in the two colleges with which Wesley was associated—Christ Church, where he was an undergraduate, and Lincoln, where he was admitted to a Fellowship. Through these commemorative gatherings attention has once again been drawn to one of England's, and of Oxford's, most remarkable sons, and to that religious movement he initiated—of which Lecky, in words now very familiar, said that it was 'of greater historic importance than all the splendid victories by land and by sea under Pitt.'

We are living in days when a more dispassionate historical judgment of John Wesley and his work is possible than at any previous time. It is no longer felt necessary in the interests of sect or prejudice to seek either to belittle him and his work, or to make unduly grandiose claims on his behalf. He has, it may be justly said, come now into that which is securely his own. The fires of past controversies have long since died down, as by the unfailing mercy of history they always do. Our 'Reformations,' 'Eighteenth Century Revivals,' 'Oxford Movements' vanish in time into the uncontentious past. It thus becomes possible to essay, not without hope of success, judicial and just appraisals. Nor is this to suggest that anyone can be entirely without historical or psychological bias. The forces which made such movements as we have referred to are still with us, and doubtless will remain as long as man endures upon this planet. In our present midst there are innumerable smaller Luthers, Wesleys, and Newmans, emphasizing in their own narrower fashion those aspects of truth which received from them such epochal stress. It is well to remember that, as we estimate the past, there are two subjectivities we can never escape: first, that we are in large measure what the past has made us, and, second, that the only past which we can endeavour to estimate is that which our

individual present enables us to discern. There is much point in Anatole France's frank expression of the inescapable subjectivity of criticism :

> 'To be quite frank, the critic ought to say "Gentlemen, I am going to speak about myself *à propos* of Shakespeare, *à propos* of Racine, or of Pascal, or of Goethe."'

Whatever else he was, John Wesley was a born leader. It was hardly in him to be led. The portraits which have come down to us reveal in the finely-marked features and in the indomitable serenity of his gaze that he was one of those who are born into the world to make history. Wherever he was, by mental constitution he could hardly be other than leader. He was of those who fit into Carlyle's category of 'Heroes.' They are found in all walks of life. Sometimes they become outstanding statesmen, sometimes military leaders of genius, and sometimes—when their energies are sublimated and inspired by the vision of spiritual reality—prophetic or religious leaders. Even before Wesley's 'conversion' on May 24th, 1738, he had manifested this quality. The Holy Club, which he did not found, had in him its natural and inevitable leader. It was no pliant and pliable mind that said, when told by the illustrious Bishop Butler to leave Bristol since he was not commissioned to preach in the diocese, 'Here I stay.'

The Church was fortunate in producing such a son in the eighteenth century. Many hard things have been said of that century, both as to its low standard of individual and social morality and as to its anaemic religious manifestations. It is not easy for some to realize to-day that there was a time in our history when such a judgment as that of the not unsympathetic French philosophic historian, Montesquieu, was possible : 'There is no such thing as religion in England.' Carlyle spoke of 'the spiritual paralysis of the age,' and pungently phrased the characteristics of the eighteenth century in 'soul extinct : stomach well alive.'

It is not necessary to accept these judgments as wholly just while acknowledging that they give a true indication of the trend of life at the time. Wesley's great work was in awaking the masses of the country to a recognition of the reality and claims of religion. To this he devoted himself with an energy that never tired and a will that never acknowledged defeat. We marvel in this age of easy and comfortable travel how he endured the

fatigues attendant upon his toilsome journeys. As 'the great itinerant' he covered more than 250,000 miles on the roads, paths, tracks of eighteenth century England in all weathers, afoot, on horseback and, in the last years, by coach.

It has frequently been pointed out that Wesley was no subjectivist in religious matters. He believed profoundly in the necessity of the *Institution*. In other words, he had an intensely *practical* mind. He could not abide the thought of Christians in isolation. He therefore bent his energies to the perfecting of an organization which eventually became a separate Church. Wesley could not help organizing. It was his *métier*. Macaulay claimed for him 'a genius for government not inferior to that of Richelieu.' 'I know,' he himself said, 'this is the peculiar talent which God has given me.'

The result of this led, as a recent writer in the *Times* has said, 'to a larger disunion of English Christians.' Which indeed is inescapably true. But as to whether this was in accord with Wesley's wish and intention it is not easy to speak with perfect impartiality. Wesley was of course an Anglican. There was in him also much of the Puritan. Like most of us his personality was no perfectly symmetrical unity. His acute logical faculty always bowed before the exigencies of the practical situation. In this he was characteristically English. His theories of Church government were all made subsidiary to the necessities of the one great task he had given himself to accomplish. They were means, not ends. 'I look upon all the world as my parish' he said in 1739 at the age of thirty-six—the familiar words inscribed on the Wesley monument in Westminster Abbey unveiled by Dean Stanley in 1878—and added, 'In whatever part I am, I judge it meet, right, and my bounden duty to declare unto all who are willing to hear the glad tidings of salvation.'

To understand Wesley's complex mentality, it is well to remember his family history. This helps us to understand on the one hand his catholic breadth and historic sense, and on the other his intensity and individuality. Both his great grandfather and his grandfather were ejected from their livings in 1662 when they resisted the Act of Uniformity. His father, Samuel Wesley, was trained for the Non-Conformist ministry, but eventually entered the Church of England. His mother, Susannah Wesley, a very remarkable woman, was herself the daughter of an ejected

divine. She may justly and fittingly be called 'the Mother of Methodism.' She frequently manifested a fine and wise independence of mind in counselling her headstrong and traditionalist son. One illustration of this is found in her letter to him when he had indicated his alarm and displeasure on hearing that Maxwell, his earliest helper, had begun to preach. Wesley, by the way, seems to have forgotten at this time the precedent in the Little Poor Brothers of St. Francis, who were, of course, originally laymen. 'John,' she wrote to him, 'take care what you do with respect to that young man, for he is as surely called of God to preach as you are. Examine what have been the fruits of his preaching and hear him for yourself.' The truth is that there was frequent war within Wesley's mind between his regard for tradition and his intense independence. It was only, for example, after many misgivings that he approved field-preaching. Whitefield had defended preaching in the open in his grandiloquent fashion: 'I thought I might be doing the service of my Creator who had a mountain for his pulpit and the heavens for a sounding board.' It was only later that Wesley 'submitted to be made more vile, and proclaimed in the highways the glad tidings of salvation.' 'What marvel that the devil does not love field-preaching? Neither do I; I love a commodious room, a soft cushion, a handsome pulpit. But where is my zeal, if I do not trample all these underfoot, in order to save one more soul?'

It is perhaps sufficient to say that Wesley frequently spoke one way and acted another. He vowed to the last his allegiance to his Mother Church. Yet he felt himself justified in ordaining Coke to 'superintend' the Methodist Societies in America. The forthright Americans could see no reason why they should not call their 'superintendants' by the New Testament term, 'bishops.' The somewhat humorous sally of Pius X in his Encyclical *Pascendi* might with a certain appropriateness have been given by the eighteenth century bishops with regard to Wesley's claim to be a loyal son of the Church of England:

> 'In the meantime the proper course for the Catholic will be to proclaim publicly his profound respect for Authority, while never ceasing to follow his own judgment.'

The controversy, however, as to whether Wesley wanted his societies to be within, or distinct from, the Church is a somewhat barren one, and is better where it is, *viz.* in the past. The facts

are as they are. It may, however, be said impartially that if Wesley were to arise to-day, there would probably be sufficient wisdom and courage in the Church which begot him to retain him and his followers. There is sufficient insight to-day to discern, behind his impetuous and overbearing characteristics, the great soul of sincerity that he was and the great religious work that he wrought.

There are few more remarkable things in history than the astonishing growth of the religious communities which he founded. His claim that the world was his parish has been in a quite extraordinary way prophetic. When he died, in 1791, his followers were spread throughout the United Kingdom and New England. Those who would now call themselves Methodists number in the five continents not less than thirty-five millions, and are frequently stated to be the largest of all Protestant communities. Those who are interested in statistics may consult the year-books of the several churches.

It will not be unfitting to say in the pages of the *Modern Churchman* something on the relation of Wesley, and of Methodism, to the thought movements of his time. It is common among evangelical writers of all shades and sects to contrast eighteenth century Methodism with Deism. The first is usually regarded as in large measure a reaction from the second. The suppression of 'Deism' is generally esteemed one of the crowning glories of Methodism. These contentions are not wholly true, though doubtless much may be said in their behalf. The question ultimately resolves itself into the relation of Reason to Faith and of Faith to Reason: or, in other words, into what is meant by 'Deism' and what is regarded as the essential content of Methodism. Were the Deists opposed to religion, and did they merit the appellation frequently assigned to them—'the hosts of unbelief'? And were all Methodists opposed to the exercise of the human reason? An affirmative answer to these questions is to-day hardly possible.

It is necessary to distinguish between the various and varied opinions of those who were styled 'Deists,' and that philosophical theory of the relation of God to the world which has been known as 'Deism.' In some respects the Deists were the forerunners of many modern Christian thinkers whose views are hardly questioned to-day even in the straitest sects of ortho-

doxy. They rejected the infallibility concept. They believed in historical investigation and refused to harbour the fundamental scepticism that its results would lead to the negation of the truths of religion. They sought in their own day to escape that radical dualism of 'natural' and 'revealed' religion which is still at the bottom of many of our theological perplexities. Yet, on the other hand, Deism is the name given to a philosophic theory of God and His relation to the universe which has been rendered untenable.

It is likewise necessary to distinguish between the views of Wesley in various matters of theological opinion and that fundamental emphasis of his, and of Methodism, on the reality and validity of religious experience. Wesley of course accepted many theological opinions which few, if any, modern Methodists accept. The 'Standards' of Methodism—the *Notes on the N.T.* and the *Forty-four Sermons*—are interpreted or accepted by modern Wesleyan ministers in a similar manner and spirit to the Anglican interpretation and acceptance of the Prayer Book, and the Presbyterian interpretation and acceptance of the Westminster Confession. In defence of this inevitable 'economy' of interpretation it can be said that Wesley himself was the last man to wish to fetter thought in regard to speculative questions. Mental sloth was to him one of the heinous sins.

> 'Know ye not then so much as this,' he wrote in a university sermon in 1741, 'you that are called moral men, that all idleness is immorality; that there is no grosser dishonesty than sloth; that every voluntary blockhead is a knave? . . . Oh, what is so scarce as learning, save religion!'

He combined with his evangelical fervour and with his genius for organization an unwearied interest in all branches of knowledge. Like most eminent teachers and preachers he probably exercised a considerable amount of 'pedagogic tact,' and doubtless some of his speculative opinions were locked in his own breast. But he was no expert in the art of hiding his opinions, and never acquired the theological facility for shuffling. In his preface, for example, to the discourse of the Cambridge Platonist, John Smith, on *The True Way of Attaining Divine Knowledge*, he said:

> 'I am sensible some parts of the following discourses are scarce intelligible to unlearned readers. But I could not prevail with myself, on that account, to rob those who can understand them of so great a treasure.'

In 1756 he recommended the works of the Cambridge Platonist, Henry More, to the study of his brother clergy. He joined with the 'men of reason' in the eighteenth century in 'desiring a religion founded on reason, and every way agreeable thereto,' as he said in his *Earnest Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*, the work next to his *Journal* most worth reading:

> 'We therefore not only allow, but earnestly exhort, all who seek after true religion to use all the reason which God hath given them in searching out the things of God.'

Chief, also, among the abiding contributions of Wesley to the emancipation of the human mind and spirit must be recognized his whole-hearted repudiation of that rigid Calvinism of Puritan theology. He could not regard it as 'consistent with either the divine justice or mercy that it was decreed from eternity that such a determinate part of mankind should be saved, and that a vast majority of the world were only born to death.' In this most moderns will agree with him. It is not too much to say with a recent correspondent in the *Times*:

> 'The history of England proves the success of the smashing blows which Wesley dealt against Calvinism and on behalf of spiritual and moral emancipation.'

The abiding contribution of Wesley, however, to religious thought is the emphasis on Experience. Wesley believed in no absentee or merely transcendent God of the Deists. His God was the God who was near, not far, who spoke here and now, who was perpetually operative in the hearts and minds of men. And it is in his emphasis on the reality and validity of spiritual experience that his real antagonism to rationalistic Deism is found. The Deistic God was always there, but never here; always then but never now; in the *fiat* of creation, but not in the orderly sequences of evolution. So 'undivine a world' as this creed necessitates, we believe, it is one of the main tasks of modern religious thought to extirpate from the theology in which it is enshrined; and in this task and mission John Wesley would, if alive today, be, we believe, on the side of the emancipators.

Wesley was always, it has been well said, 'comparatively indifferent to orthodoxy, so long as a man had the witness of the Spirit, proving itself in works of faith.' He did not confound, with so much later thought, theology and religion. In his sermon on the Trinity he maintained that intellectual assent to truths is not religion.

> 'Even right opinion is as distant from religion as the east is from the west. Persons may be quite right in their opinions, and yet have no religion at all; and, on the other hand, persons may be truly religious who hold many wrong opinions.'

With regard to the Trinity itself, he went on to say that 'it was an evil hour' when the 'explainers' began 'their fruitless work,' adding, 'I insist upon no explication at all.' He also went on to state:

> 'I dare not insist upon anyone's using the word Trinity or Person. I use them myself without any scruple, because I know of none better: but if any man has any scruple concerning them, who shall constrain him to use them? I cannot.'

Wesley was never tired of declaring that 'faith' in any Christian sense is not the assent of the mind to doctrinal propositions, and one of his favourite ways of clinching this assertion was by stating that if it were not so the devil would be a most excellent Christian.

Wesley's main emphasis in religion was to recall from the worship of dogma to the necessity of religious experience and to the service of the kingdom. This we regard as his essential contribution to religious thought. It is perhaps no less necessary to-day than in the eighteenth century, and it is certainly truly 'modernist.' To quote the words of Dr. Scott Lidgett:

> 'The moderatist conception of the days in which Wesley lived—that Christianity was a supernatural revelation artificially conveyed by experiences which came to a complete end with the apostles, and that then it was committed to the custody of a divine institution, while the world was at the best to run on in moralised secularity—is laughed to scorn to-day, as much by philosophic thought as by experimental religion.'

It is only necessary to guard against the perennial danger, to which all history bears witness, of petrifying the vitalizing experiences of Wesley's age into adamantine dogmas which succeeding ages may be asked to regard as a static *depositum*. It is one of the enigmas of history to note how those whose life and spirit challenged the finality of previous dogmatic formulations came with a certain psychological inevitability to be established as final authorities by those who call themselves their followers. The 'followers' so frequently negate and seek to slay the inner spirit of those they regard as their 'leader.' 'The letter killeth, the spirit giveth life.'

It is perhaps sufficient to add that the theology of Methodism is undergoing the same developments as that of the rest of the

Christian world. There is a certain elasticity in the 'Standards' of Methodism which is favourable to this development. For, as Sir Percy Bunting, the late editor of *The Contemporary Review*, pointed out, in one place or another are found included all the great lines of Christian thought. 'It would be difficult to prove a minister heterodox while he could put passage against passage and show that the discrepancies were involved in the very substance of Christian theology itself.'

An honoured place in the roll of the Church's prophets and leaders is assured to John Wesley. It is well to find his face with Wycliffe, Westcott, and others in the great east window of the latest English cathedral, that of Liverpool. Its presence there is the act of the Church which bare him and which, in spite of her timidities and his impetuosities, he loved to the end.

A BIOLOGIST'S OPINION OF BIRTH CONTROL*

By Professor Julian S. Huxley, M.A.

BIRTH control is a subject which can be considered from many points of view, and I am not competent to consider it from more than a few. I shall try to deal with it largely from my professional point of view as a biologist, and partly as a citizen and an ordinary human being who, therefore, must have some, even if elementary, form of moral philosophy; but I do not feel myself competent to discuss it in its moral aspect from the point of view of a professional moral philosopher, nor in its medical aspect from the point of view of a doctor.

I use the term birth control because it is the one in general use. It would be perhaps more accurate to use the term family limitation, the term 'birth control' being usually limited to definite contraceptive measures. Let us, however, take it in the broader sense of any measures tending to limit the natural size of the family.

First, let us consider the subject on its purely biological side, in the most dispassionate way possible, as if we were people

* An address given at the Guild House, Eccleston Square, on February 28th, 1926.

from some other planet, or biologists studying the habits of some lower organism which interests us but does not concern us directly. There are two chief biological problems connected with the subject, one immediate and one less pressing. The more immediate one is the problem of the differential fertility of different social or economic classes of the population. Dr. Stevenson, who collected reliable statistics on the birth rate, divided the population into five main groups. He started with the upper and upper-middle classes, including the aristocracy and the professional classes; No. 5 included unskilled workers and casual labourers, and Nos. 2, 3 and 4 were intermediate. Taking the children surviving above one year, the infant mortality period, he found the fertility per 100 families was: Class No. 1, 190 children; No. 2, 241; No. 3, 279; No. 4, 287; No. 5, 337. That means, roughly, that twenty per cent. of the population in this generation will give rise to about twenty-five per cent. of the next generation. The interesting fact has come to light that this was not so a hundred years ago. Then, apparently, there was no considerable difference, possibly even none at all, in the effective fertility of different classes. It was not until the end of the 'forties or early 'fifties that any difference became perceptible, and from that time onwards it increased until the end of the century. It appears now to be slightly, but only slightly, on the decrease.

Undoubtedly that difference in the fertility of different classes of the population has been due chiefly to some form or other of family limitations being practised by the upper classes more than the lower. There was a great acceleration of the process somewhere about 1870-80, which was probably due to the introduction of improved birth-control methods. This difference in fertility between different classes is by no means necessarily a bad thing. It might be a better thing if the racially better stocks were reproducing more actively, or it might be completely neutral if all the different strata of the population were, from the point of view of the race, equivalent.

In discussing whether the fact be racially good or bad, let us remind ourselves that, as far as all our scientific knowledge now goes, it is impossible to change inborn characters by education; that enormous differences may be made by education, by training in the broadest sense, but that those are not per-

petuated in the next generation. That is to say, that, at any rate so far as mental qualities go and probably as far as physical qualities go, there is no transmission of acquired characters.

Definite Units.

Then we also know, from all the work of biology in the last quarter of a century, starting with the rediscovery of Mendel's law, that heredity depends upon definite units, or factors as they are generally called, which are transmitted from the parent to the offspring and determine the potentialities of that offspring. Environment may bring out one or other of those potentialities, but there is a limitation of them, due to the actual factors transmitted. So that the racial health of a country really depends on the proportion, to put it very crudely, of good and bad factors in the constitution of its population; and it might be possible for individual health to be going up—that is to say, for people to die less early, not to suffer so much from disease, to be bigger and healthier on the whole—and yet for the racial health to be going down. People might be realizing their innate possibilities more fully, but the whole level of those possibilities might be going down from generation to generation, so that the racial effect might easily be masked by the effect on each generation, at any rate for a very considerable time.

This question as to whether there is an innate difference of any sort between the classes is a very difficult one. One would imagine *a priori* that there would be some difference. Let us take the professional class and the casual labouring class. The former have in most cases to pass certain examinations or tests to obtain their positions. That means that on the whole there is a selection, and those who do not come up to the standard do not get into that class and go into another. In the same way, those who lack certain temperamental qualities, such as grit, concentration, perseverance, etc., tend on the whole more often than others to sink in the scale until they are forced to adopt an unskilled trade or accept casual labour; and therefore the tendency is to sift one extreme to the top and the other to the bottom. It is difficult to measure innate temperamental differences, and I do not think any satisfactory method has been devised; but it is possible with some degree of accuracy to

measure innate intellectual possibilities, and it does seem that there is a real, though not high, difference between the different social strata, at any rate between the two extremes.

An elaborate test recently carried out on the whole of the school children of the County of Northumberland, except Newcastle, has shown this very clearly. That being so, it is clear, I think, to put it in the simplest way, that, though most of the differences that are observable between the average type of one economic class and another are due to training, environment, profession and so forth, yet when you strip all this away, there does remain a difference in hereditary possibility, in potentiality, and that the classes with this hereditary potentiality slightly but definitely above the average are not contributing their fair share to the next generation, and those with slightly less than the average are contributing more than their fair share.

Very often when one makes statements like this one is assailed from various angles—political angles and angles of general views of human nature. All I can say is, one cannot take account of those things in the face of what appear to be facts; those are the facts as far as they have been ascertained by dispassionate authorities. I have just had the privilege of reading the proofs of an extremely interesting book by Professor Carr Saunders, of the University of Liverpool, in the Home University Library, on *Eugenics*, and I can only refer you to that for further details. The little book on *Population* by the same author, published by the Oxford Press, also gives a great deal of valuable information bearing on the biological aspects of this problem, and Major Leonard Darwin's *Need for Eugenic Reform* provides us with a mine of facts and dispassionate discussion on the subject.

If, as appears quite definitely, this difference between the classes did not occur a hundred years ago and has increased mainly since the time when birth control began to be practised, there are only two methods of getting rid of it, if it seems to be a bad thing. One is to stop practising birth control altogether, and the other is to adjust it, or at least to equalize it, among different classes. Even the most sanguine opponent of birth control will not, I think, feel that it is possible to roll back the whole tide. Personally, the only practical solution that I see is that we must try to equalize the practice of birth control among

the different classes. Those who work in the slums, especially in relation to birth control at the voluntary clinics, tell me quite definitely that there is among a large majority of the women who come to them real ignorance of the possibility of birth control and total ignorance of practical methods. I regard as a grave definite eugenic danger the refusal of the Ministry of Health to allow information on these subjects to be given when asked for.

If we were able to obtain this equalization, then no eugenic dangers would remain, especially if we could adjust the birth rate a little, so that the professional classes were giving more than their ordinary share; but there would remain the general population problem. If the birth rate is greater than the death rate, the population increases. The population problem is not a pressing one for the world as a whole, but within a short time, biologically, it will become a pressing problem, unless something happens. Population increases at compound interest, and if the rate of increase for the Western nations during the nineteenth century were to continue unchecked, in quite a few centuries, under a thousand years, there would hardly be standing room on the habitable parts of the globe.

A Problem to Face.

Clearly, society has got to face this problem of the increase of population. This rapid increase, when you look at history, is seen to be a very unusual phase of human life. Most savage and primitive and semi-civilized races have some method or other of regulating population roughly to a constant level. Very frequently the method is infanticide; even in ancient Greece this was practised; China is still in that stage. Sometimes there was limitation of marriage, putting off the time of marriage, and so forth; and very often methods which to-day would come under the head of criminal abortion were practised regularly, often as religious rites, by primitive tribes.

Let us also remember that for each type of economic basis of civilization there is, roughly speaking, an optimum density of population. In a tribe or community which has only reached the hunting stage there could not be so many people per square mile as in one at the pastoral stage. Again, pastoral civilization cannot support such density of population as commercial civilization, and commercial cannot support as many as our

modern industrial civilization. That is to say, one has to think of the type of civilization. Besides that, one has also to think not merely of the economic side, not only what is the optimum economically, but of other points of view also. It might be possible to have an enormously increased population and yet be economically worth while in this country by utilizing the developments of industrial science; on the other hand, it might be extremely deleterious to all sorts of other things—health, comfort, leisure and so on. Many things have to be taken into consideration.

Looking Forward.

In any case, it appears that humanity, whether two or twenty centuries hence, has got to look forward to a time when population will be roughly stable because it cannot afford to go on increasing, either for economic or other reasons. Here I think biology can put in a point of view which will help us to see this problem in rather a different perspective. We are apt to think, when we look back and see the civilizations of the past, now being revealed to us in Egypt and Babylonia, in Central America and in India, some going back five and even ten millennia before Christ—we are apt to think of the enormous antiquity of the human race. Let us, however, remember, when we are reckoning in thousands of years, or even tens of thousands of years, that those are very small units in biological evolution. Anything we should like to call advanced civilization dates back perhaps five or seven thousand years from to-day, but all the time before that, when man was evolving from his pre-human ancestors, the process was far slower and must have taken a time to be reckoned by hundreds of thousands of years—possibly half a million years. The mammalian type, whose existence made possible the evolution of the human type, has been on the earth millions of years. That being so, what is this short phase of rapid increase compared with biological time.

We have no reason to suppose that the conditions on this globe will change so as to make human life impossible in the immediate future, at any rate not for hundreds of thousands, possibly millions, of years. To me, as a biologist, it appears that humanity is not old at all, but simply in its adolescent

period. It is violently surging forward, getting new experiences, learning all sorts of things quickly. A long stable period of adult maturity lies before it. In that period of maturity population will have to be stabilized somehow. In the animal world there is always some check to multiplication. Humanity is rapidly getting rid of some of the checks to its own productiveness—pestilence and infant mortality: it is now trying to get rid of war, and undoubtedly will succeed in the next few centuries. Consequently, the population problem will become more acute unless we try to regulate it by deliberate means.

Let us also remember that we inherit from our animal ancestry the strong reproductive instincts which to animals in a state of nature are a necessity if they are to compete with others and leave offspring. Those who do not have them will not leave offspring, so they will die out and others will survive. That prominence of the reproductive instincts in our lives which puzzles and seems cruelly difficult to many people is, I think, to be accounted for as one of the numerous inheritances from our animal ancestry, which we have somehow to cope with. There is no prospect of changing this deep-rooted instinct, and so—unless we are going to revert, which is unthinkable, to such cruel methods as infanticide, plague, or war—we must come back to some sort of voluntary limitation, whether by abstention or by methods of so-called birth control.

Then, again, let us not forget, on the social side, that the mere rapidity of the increase of population brings its own problems. Social reformers are attempting to cope with the slums, and no sooner have they more or less adjusted one set of problems than they discover that the mere increase of population has brought other and different problems for them to solve. I think there again some definite slowing of the rate of increase of population is almost a necessity if we are ever to get our house in order. Let us not be alarmed at the decrease in the birth rate. If we look forward to the stable phase I have mentioned I do not think we need have any apprehension.

The next problem, more a human than a biological problem, is that of the right size of the family. Is there any right size of family? It is very difficult to lay down any rules. Almost everybody agrees that one child is not satisfactory—to the child or the parents. Nor are two children biologically sufficient. A

number of people die in infancy, others die before marriage, others do not marry, others do not have children. About four children seem to be necessary as a minimum even just to keep up the level of population. With improved methods of dealing with infant mortality, three might be sufficient, but between three and five is the biological size of the family necessary if our population is not to decline; and that seems to be a healthy size so as to give children plenty of companionship and rough-and-tumble among themselves. That would mean that the upper classes should somehow be prodded into having larger families than they have at present.

Large Families.

On the other hand, the problem is urgent when you get very large families, as you very often do in the slum population. It is a very remarkable fact, which I think almost all social reformers will agree with, that you would expect that large families would not be so prevalent when people were on the border of the poverty line, and yet the almost universal experience is that as conditions of wages and housing and economic status improve, so the size of the family goes down. The explanation is, I think, a more or less reasonable one; namely, that for these people who are living on the poverty line life, as with the little dog in the story, is simply one thing after another, and they do not have time to think about adjusting their life at all. There is no possibility of pride and interest in their life; they take children as they come and do not worry about them.

Once they get the chance of a decent home, they begin to think about some sort of education and career and other possibilities for their children, and then there is much more rational pride in family life and there is more concentration on individual children. Let us remember the biological background. As we trace the evolution of life upwards, we find at first an enormous over-production of offspring with an enormous mortality—a simply gigantic carelessness for individual lives so long as one or two survive. The sea urchin, for example, produces every year almost as many fertilized eggs as there are people in the city of London, ninety-nine per cent. doubtless dying before they are a few days old. As we go up the scale of

evolution, we get fewer offspring and better pre-natal provision, then maternal care, and finally family life. Thus Biology is on the side of quality, not quantity.

The Moral Question.

Now we come to the difficult moral question, and here, as I say, I do not want to pose as an expert. As a plain man who wishes to do right, the problem seems to me this. Marriage is an estate which has two sides to it. There is the racial side, the begetting of children, and there is the individual side, for the mutual comfort, joy and happiness of the partners: both legitimate and in a way separate; where combined they are better, because they supplement each other. To the individual side there are two sides also—the physical and the spiritual; both, again, are legitimate, natural, and, again, though they can be separated, it is far better that they should reinforce each other. Where these three aspects are present there is an ideal marriage. But suppose there is some hereditary taint in one or both parents; there is, through methods of birth control, the possibility of the individual side of marriage being realized, even if the racial is deliberately annulled, and that from the point of view of the race is a right and legitimate thing to do. Cases dealt with at birth-control clinics show that marriage is too often far from being on a high level; the woman pays, the race pays, but the husband, on the whole, does not pay. The woman's life is made miserable in a way which is unnecessary, and it seems to me it is our business to see that this shall not continue.

On the other side, there are obvious objections to the practice of birth control—the danger of indulgence after marriage and promiscuity in sex relations before marriage. Those seem to me the chief objections to the introduction of so-called birth control methods. There is the danger; but the invention of methods of birth control seems to me no different from any other invention. The fact that it is there does not preclude us from responsibility as to the way in which we use it. There is no single invention of humanity we cannot use either well or ill. Food, or drink, or scientific knowledge, as we all know, can be turned to the most appalling purposes, as we saw vividly in war time. We have to use and control our knowledge in the right way. As to the danger of greater promiscuity after

marriage, that seems to me extremely unlikely, since the greater frequency of birth control practice will, as far as I can see it, make both the physiological and psychological side of marriage far healthier than where either there are too many children or great anxiety and repression on the part of either wife or husband as to having children. In regard to the danger of promiscuity before marriage, here the question of morality comes in. Those who are only deterred from such practices by the fear of consequences can hardly be said to have a very high morality. What we need do is to inculcate right ideas and right feeling. A woman once said to me: 'When people talk about the dangers of promiscuity, one wonders whether they have ever seen the tragedy of an illegitimate baby being born by a mother who had a lapse from virtue but really was a good girl at heart'; and she said she would rather see a hundred or a thousand cases of misconduct than the tragedy of one illegitimate child. That too is a point of view that has to be taken into consideration.

Then there is the question of health. On that subject I shall only say that I am assured by my friends who run voluntary clinics that there is no danger to health in following their advice.

Let me sum up. As far as I see it personally, some form of family limitation—which on account of being what it is will, largely at any rate, be what we call birth control—seems the only hope in the long run for the general problem of the population, the prevention of the world being over-populated; it seems to be the only cure for the dysgenic process of the differential birth-rate in the various classes at present going on. Finally, it seems to me the only way in which we can adjust the physiological inheritance in regard to our instincts which, through no fault of our own, we have received from our ancestors, to the new economic and social population conditions which are gradually coming into being. Conditions to-day are not the same in regard to any of those points as they were two centuries ago. The positive task remains to work out the best possible methods of birth control in relation to physical and mental well-being; and finally, even more important, if one accepts the idea of some method of birth control as inevitable, to construct new standards on the basis of this point of view which shall be adjusted to no less high standards of general morality than those of previous ages.

NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM AND THE PERSON OF JESUS CHRIST*

By the Rev. H. Kenneth Luce, M.A., Master of the King's Scholars, Westminster School, and author of *St. Matthew's Gospel in English.*

THE science of Biblical criticism is still young—not a century old. Yet with the Old Testament, even in that time, progress has been rapid, and the results of criticism are to a great degree assured and widely accepted. With the New Testament things are different. The opposition to criticism has been far stronger with regard to the New Testament than the Old; and even the more cautious critics are still hotly resisted when they leave the province of textual or documentary investigation and presume to offer suggestions for the interpretation of Jesus. That this should be so is not surprising, yet it is highly significant. It is not surprising, for criticism of the Old Testament, however startling its results, could have no really vital effect upon orthodox Christianity: while there are many who feel that criticism of the New Testament is an indefinitely disruptive force to which they are afraid to expose the faith they have received. And yet it is highly significant because it compels us to face the fact that if official Christianity is to accept the conclusions of modern criticism, *whatever they are*—and thus, as I believe, and thus only, retain the allegiance of thinking men in the future—many changes will have to be made, changes which to some of us seem so far-reaching as to be likely to alter, not merely the form or expression of the Christian Faith, but in many respects its fundamental ideas as they have been traditionally presented.

I do not think there can be any doubt that far the most important problem that the New Testament presents to the educated mind to-day is that of the Person of Jesus Christ. My work keeps me continually in contact with the religious ideas and difficulties of the more intelligent public-school boy—who may, I think, be taken as typical of the educated laity—and my experience is that there is no other religious problem so universal and so pressing as this. Nothing else matters in com-

* A paper read to the London Branch of the Churchmen's Union.

parison with it. There are religious difficulties in the sphere of philosophy, science, ethics; there are difficulties connected with such subjects as prayer, worship, sacraments which perplex and, if unanswered, deter: but still men find in their answer to those five words 'What think ye of Christ?' the most fundamental religious decision of all that they are called upon to make.

In the light of my experience with the public-school boy I wish to treat in this paper some few of the problems which surround the Person of Jesus. I do not hope to indicate their solution, or even to throw new light upon them. Perhaps, however, I shall at least be able to show you how pressing is the need for bold re-statement in the Church's Christology. For the public-school boy of to-day is, as I have said, the educated layman of to-morrow: and if when his mind is at its most receptive stage he once finds the Church guilty of intellectual dishonesty in this central doctrine, he will not easily reverse the verdict in later years.

What sort of a boy was Jesus? Was He sinless from His earliest days, dedicated to a purpose that shone before Him as steadily in His boyhood as when He had grown to be a man? Had He full consciousness from the beginning that He was Messiah—nay, more, Son of God in the Christian sense? Did He think Himself different from the other boys with whom He played? Did Mary think Him different—except as other mothers regard their own sons? Such are the questions which demand an answer right at the beginning of the Gospels.

Orthodox theology does not seem to face such questions frankly—perhaps because it finds it more convenient to ignore them. Yet undoubtedly the impression which the teaching of the Church has produced in the popular mind is that the Gospels show that Jesus was completely sinless from His birth—a birth unlike the birth of all other men—and that from the beginning He was dominated by a constant consciousness that He was divine. Let us examine the Gospel material.

The Miraculous Conception of Jesus is obviously not a fact that could be rejected or accepted solely on grounds of literary evidence, yet it is well to realize the character of the literary evidence which is often adduced to support it. It consists, as you know, of two largely different stories in the two later Synoptic Gospels—and these stories are, moreover, out of har-

mony both in style and in several points of detail with the remainder of those Gospels. The fact of the miraculous conception is not mentioned or implied in the rest of the New Testament.

The story of the visit to Jerusalem at the age of twelve, if it is to be regarded as historical—and I cannot see any reason why it should not—is sometimes grossly misinterpreted. The picture the Church has presented of it has often been an unattractive one—the boy Jesus lecturing to the astonished and disgruntled Rabbis, almost rudely putting Mary and Joseph in their place by an appeal to His Divine origin. Yet there is another quite natural interpretation of the story which is no doubt familiar to many of you. We see Jesus at an age when a boy's mind begins to seek knowledge of every kind, and when the question 'What am I to be?' begins to present itself. We see him listening eagerly to the Rabbis' discussions on the subject with which He no doubt already felt that His life was to be connected, just as a boy who wants to be a sailor may listen almost reverentially to the talk of a naval officer staying at his home. Luke says that Jesus asked further questions; when a point was not clear to Him He asked them to explain, and they were astonished at His intelligence — not at His knowledge. The story as we have it in Luke may possibly have suffered some adaptation or addition as it passed through the hands of those who felt themselves compelled to find the supernatural in all that Jesus did or said. But if we interpret the story naturally, we can surely see the first stirrings in Jesus' mind of what today we call a sense of vocation—the call from God to His work in the world.

Then Jesus' Baptism. Was it merely a concession or example to human sinfulness—'Suffer it to be so now, for so it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness'—as thousands have thought from the time of the writer of the first Gospel down to the present day? Or was it a real experience in the spiritual life of Jesus, the moment when the sense of vocation that had before been shadowy became clear and compelling, when the spirit of God came into touch with the human spirit of Jesus and claimed Him for Its work? Jesus, we may suppose, approached His baptism with feelings not far different from those of His friends—perhaps He, too, felt the need for moral cleansing

when Messiah was proclaimed to be near—but afterwards there is upon Him a new inspiration : His work is to bring His people back to God.

The Baptism is the first of those four great studies in the Personality of Jesus which our Gospels present to us : the others are the Temptation, the Transfiguration, and the Agony. I do not wish to deal with them in detail now, but I would ask you to consider what seems to me a highly important difference of principle in the manner in which the interpretation is attempted. Often they are regarded as isolated events in the life of Jesus—isolated both in the sense that they are not clearly connected with what precedes and follows them, and also in the sense that they could not have happened in any degree to anyone else than Jesus. Hence their importance to Jesus Himself is underestimated. Here again criticism may point the way to a truer interpretation. These stories are the record of the emotions and struggles in the human soul of Jesus—they arise out of what is behind and before Him—they were moments of supreme importance to Jesus Himself and they are of the utmost importance to us to-day both in understanding His life and making it the pattern of our own. These experiences in Jesus' life, as in human life to-day, represent the contact of the human with the Divine. The Temptation, following as it did the call of God at the Baptism—a deliberate retirement to think out the meaning of the call and what it implied for the future; the communion with God on the mountain, when in spite of the joy of Peter's confession the future had nothing but failure and death to offer; the cry of terror and appeal in the face of death—all these show the weakness of human nature searching for and finding the strength of God. How different is such an interpretation as this to that which regards the Baptism as an example to human sinfulness, the Temptation a symbolic conflict with evil, the Transfiguration a demonstration to the disciples of Christ's Divinity, and the Agony a revulsion of feeling at the sins of mankind. It is my experience that the modern mind finds in the interpretation I have put before you something which brings Jesus right down into human life and makes His personality something irresistibly attractive and inspiring—something which the Church has too often failed to put before the world.

But I must pass on to other matters. There are some indications that the miraculous element in religion as a whole is becoming less of a controversial point than it was a few years ago. Scientists tend more and more to moderation in their claim to ultimate knowledge, and the term 'natural law' is recognized to define limited experience rather than universal certainty. So the criterion for judging an alleged miracle is now perhaps not so much the possibility of its occurrence, as the analogies of experience with regard to it, and its moral suitability and significance. And so it is with the miracles of Jesus. The important question with regard to them is not the possibility of their having occurred—though of some of the stories told in our Gospels we are compelled to say that we have no analogies of experience by which to judge them—but rather their moral suitability to Jesus and their significance in His life. Here there are two widely divergent views. The one regards miracle as evidence of Divinity, and the working of miracle therefore as one of the main proofs of the revelation of God to man in Jesus.[1] The other is expressed by Matthew Arnold's well-known remark, 'Suppose I could change the pen with which I write these words into a pen-wiper, I should not thus make what I write any truer or more convincing,' and places the working of miracle on the circumference, not at the centre, of Jesus' life. I expect that nearly all in this room would take the latter view, and I need not labour the point: but I do not know whether you will have noticed one passage in St. Mark which shows clearly enough Jesus' own view of the place of miracle in His life. It is in Mark's first chapter. Jesus has been healing many in the evening at Capernaum, and His fame and popularity is growing fast. Next morning very early Jesus goes out alone to pray: Peter and the others come to find Him after a while. 'All men seek for thee,' they say: the rush to be healed has begun again. Jesus' answer was not what they expected. 'Let us go into another town,' He says, 'that I may proclaim my message there also: for *that* is why I have come forth.' He breaks quite definitely—not, as His solitary prayer shows, without a struggle—with the popularity that He is winning. He finds it a hindrance to His true work of teaching. Considering

[1] Such is the view expressed in Headlam's *The Miracles of the New Testament*, possibly the most widely read modern work on the subject.

the tendency towards exaggeration of the miraculous that even our own Gospels have—a tendency carried to an almost incredible extreme in the later Apocryphal Gospels—it is highly significant that Jesus' own point of view on this matter is so faithfully reported here by Mark.

I fear I may have been flogging a dead horse in deprecating before this audience the exaggerated importance given to miracle by some interpreters of Jesus' life. But you will agree with me that it is a most important matter in the presentation of Jesus to the modern world. Jesus the Teacher of the Love of God, whose own love when touched by suffering brings into action wonderfully potent forces of healing and comfort, is a very different figure from Jesus the Wizard who seeks to convince men of His Divinity by demonstrations of miraculous power. The one attracts by the reality of His title to Humanity; the other repels by the falsity of His claim to Divinity.

May I now draw your attention rather more shortly to three or four other points with regard to the Person of Jesus, considering them particularly, as we have those I have already mentioned, as they affect the appeal of Jesus to the educated mind? Take first the Apocalyptic element in Jesus' thought. The question is a deeper one than many people imagine. The point at issue is not merely whether Jesus believed that the Kingdom would be catastrophically established and He Himself return in glory within the lifetime of His contemporaries, and was mistaken in that belief. It concerns rather the self-consistency of Jesus' view of life, the clearness of His thought about the nature of God and the destiny of man. Within the last thirty or forty years there has come to light much new evidence of the nature of those imaginative writings with which the Jews kept their hopes alive during the centuries of persecution immediately before the birth of Jesus—writings widely current in Jesus' own day. On the two most fundamental points in any religious system—the nature of God and the destiny of man—these writings present strikingly different ideas from those that underlie the main part of Jesus' teaching. The Apocalyptic books often represent God as merciless and unforgiving, delighting in the sufferings of the wicked, and willing to abandon most of mankind to eternal punishment. Jesus shows God as a loving Father who cares infinitely for the saving of every human soul.

In the Apocalyptic books the great majority of mankind, all except the very few who never broke the Law, are regarded as worthless, born only to be destroyed by the anger of God. Jesus valued human nature supremely, and sought the lost sheep till He found it. According to the Apocalyptists, the only hope of salvation for any man was complete innocence as regards the Law. Jesus taught that innocence might be worthless if it was not made active by deeds of love. The fact that it is to the Apocalyptists in large measure that Judaism and Christianity alike owe their doctrine of a blessed future life for the faithful only makes the contrast that I have described more startling.

If, then, the Apocalyptic element is one of the chief elements in Jesus' teaching, if, that is to say, He saw Himself as the central figure of the Apocalyptic books, the agent of God at whose coming the storm clouds of God's anger break upon the world; then it seems difficult to escape the conclusion that Jesus' ideas on those great subjects were contradictory and confused. Yet in the past orthodox Church teaching has either discreetly ignored the Apocalyptic element in the Gospels or else has allowed it to stand side by side with the rest of Jesus' teaching, in clear contradiction to much of what is most characteristic of Him.

Here again, I believe, criticism may resolve the contradiction. Even in our own Gospels we can see traces of the introduction of Apocalyptic ideas into material which had no such ideas before.[2] It is therefore entirely reasonable to suppose that the same process may have been going on in far greater degree behind the scenes. The minds of the men of Jesus' day and the generation after him were full of Apocalyptic ideas. They would be naturally eager to identify Jesus with the Apocalyptic Son of Man, and in a surprisingly short time the confusion of ideas would be complete.

Another important point is the relation of Jesus to Judaism. The attitude of the Jews towards Jesus has commonly been represented as one of complete antagonism: and that of Jesus towards them of unreserved condemnation. The work of Jewish

[2] Examples of this are collected in that stimulating book, *The Lord of Thought,* by the late Miss Dougall and Mr. Emmet, published by the Student Christian Movement a few years ago, which works out fully the view referred to above.

scholars in recent years has made it quite clear that this is an exaggeration. Judaism—even Pharisaic Judaism—is seen to be far less black than the Gospels paint it: and what is best in Judaism falls very little short of the Christian standard. The Jewish leaders who appear in the Gospels are naturally those who come most bitterly into conflict with Jesus, but it must be regarded as probable that there were many more like the scribe of whom Mark tells, who won from Jesus the words 'Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.' I do not mean that we must not regard Jesus as having censured with the strongest disapproval the insincerity and lack of proportion exhibited by many of those whose place it was to be 'shepherds of the people.' But to condemn the Jews wholesale, whether in their religious organization or their ethical teaching, is, in the light of modern knowledge, only to weaken the Christian appeal to the educated mind.

With regard to the teaching of Jesus, I would suggest to you that we are accustomed to assign a too narrowly religious meaning to some of His sayings and parables. Let me give you one or two instances. The Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard is usually, I think, interpreted in one of two ways. Either that the reward of Christians who joined the Church later would be no less than that of the earliest followers of Jesus: or, more commonly, that it is never too late to repent, even at the eleventh hour. But it is possible to interpret the parable in a far wider sense, as illustrating the great truth that it is not the quantity of success that God measures and rewards, but the use each man has made of the opportunities he has had. From the one-hour man all that is expected is one hour's work well done. And is it not inherently probable that a mind like that of Jesus, with its wide wisdom as well as its deep sympathy for mankind, should have thought out that terribly constant problem of the inequality of opportunity in human life? The modern mind sees appallingly widespread evidence of inequality of opportunity, in health, moral environment, education, money, and many other things. And still the only solution of the problem is that of this parable of Jesus that 'many who are first shall be last, and the last first.'

Or again, is not the Parable of the Tares a strikingly modern treatment of the problem of evil? Most modern thinkers ap-

proach that problem along the lines of the possibility of evil being necessarily implied in the possibility of good. Man has free-will and the power to affect other men. These two facts together produce both good and evil. If you took away either you would, it is true, prevent evil; but you would also preclude the possibility of good. Thus the tares and the wheat grow side by side.

It is the same with some of the shorter sayings of Jesus. 'Take no thought for the morrow' does not commend short-sighted prodigality. 'Be not consumed with anxiety about the morrow,' says Jesus; 'do your best and leave the rest to God.' 'Love your enemies' does not mean '*like* your enemies,' but 'do not regard a man as outside the love-fellowship just because he is your enemy, but be ready to help him when you get the chance.' 'You cannot serve God and Mammon' does not demand poverty of all Christians. 'You cannot be *a slave* of two masters,' says Jesus. 'If you are wholly taken up with your pursuit of what is material you will not have time for God.' The appeal of Christianity to the modern mind is blunted by the way in which many such sayings of Jesus are treated as the hopelessly ideal precepts of one who was out of touch with the realities of human life.

Did Jesus intend to found a Church? Or, more correctly, did Jesus lay down any rules, or promise any divine authority for His followers when, as was inevitable, they organized themselves into a separate community? Many important matters depend on the answer to that question—the nature of Authority in the Church, for instance, the Priesthood, the doctrines of Absolution and Sacraments, and so on. With these matters in detail I am not now concerned. What has criticism to say of the words in our Gospels in virtue of which the authority of Jesus is claimed for such doctrines? Many of these sayings are clearly not of the earliest stratum in the Gospels. They seem, to use a psychological term, to be rationalizations of existing facts—that is to say, when the Church had come into existence and was asserting its authority over its members, as communities always tend to do, the justification for such authority was read back into the thoughts and words of the Founder. Take, for instance, the passage in Matthew on which excommunication has been based throughout Church history. If the sinner refuses to

listen to the Church, 'let him be unto you as an heathen man and a publican.' Is it conceivable that Jesus the friend of publicans and sinners could have used those words? And, what is more, does not the fact that such words could be attributed to Jesus within forty years after His death show how quickly the leaven of ecclesiastical exclusiveness and arrogance had begun its fatal work in the Christian fellowship? Thus it is that to-day the majority of Christians, some of them even inside our own Church, are dominated by a mechanical system of religious authority scarcely less burdensome than the system of Judaism which in its narrower forms Jesus gave His life to break down.

I have left till last the most fundamental of all the problems connected with the Person of Jesus—the question of His pre-existence. It is the most fundamental because the view held with regard to it determines a man's whole attitude towards Jesus. Yet because it is largely a philosophical question it is hard for the ordinary layman to approach it directly, and it is usually best approached by the study of some of the problems I have already touched on. It was through their knowledge of Him as Man that the disciples came to look on Jesus as Divine. I cannot do more than sketch briefly the different views held on the subject.

The traditional view, still far the commonest to-day, holds that both the divine and the human elements in Jesus were eternally pre-existent within the Godhead. This view, while claiming the strictest orthodoxy, usually, as Dean Rashdall used to say, falls into the glaring heresy of worshipping three Gods instead of one. Among those who hold a more modern view there are, I think, two main divisions. There are those who, like Dean Rashdall himself, base their view upon the Logos doctrine of the Fourth Gospel—the product of combined Jewish and Greek philosophy. The *human* soul of Jesus did not pre-exist, yet Jesus may be said to have pre-existed in the sense that the Word or Wisdom of God which was united with the human soul of Jesus was itself eternal. This Logos, while supremely incarnate in Jesus, is yet to some degree incarnate in all that is good in human life; and thus human nature at its highest is divine.[3]

[3] I would recommend here Rashdall's little book, *Jesus Human and Divine,* for a simple exposition of this view.

Then there are the more extreme of modern theologians—Foakes-Jackson and Lake, for instance—who deny any kind of pre-existence to Jesus. They regard Jesus as entirely the product of His forbears—teacher, prophet, healer, with a unique perception of God—but nothing more. If human nature at its highest is akin to the divine, this is not in itself a denial of the Divinity of Jesus. But it involves a drastic re-statement of much of the Church's theology.

I have touched, somewhat sketchily I fear, on several questions affecting the Personality of Jesus, many of them controversial and of the greatest difficulty. I do not pretend that we can reach certainty upon them, and in any case it is foolish to claim exclusive truth for one's own views. What I am concerned to emphasize is that if the Church is to commend herself to the modern mind, if she is to enlist in her Fellowship of Active Love those who are best fitted for her work, she must not be afraid to discuss with the utmost frankness such questions as I have raised: and she must be ready to face honestly and fearlessly the consequences to her doctrine and organization of the conclusions to which she may be led.

THE PRINCIPLE OF ENGLISH MODERNISM*

THE ELDER SHALL SERVE THE YOUNGER.—*Genesis* XXV, 23.

THIS seems at first sight improper and unjust. Yet it is a law of human life, and upon obedience to it human progress depends. The pleasures and interests of every elder generation are subordinated to providing subsistence, education and improved conditions for the younger generation. Civilization is built upon this sacrificial service of the elder for the younger. Whilst the best parents try to impart more to their children than they themselves received, there are other parents so selfish and so inhuman as to be satisfied to impart less, parents who, having received health, wealth, education, honour, hand on to their children disease, poverty, ignorance, disgrace. If this were common, civilization would disappear. That it is excep-

*A Sermon preached in Westminster Abbey on Sunday, April 18, 1926, by the Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, M.A., D.D., Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

tional is shown by the progress civilization is making. Thus the law of every progressive civilization is this: 'The elder shall serve the younger.'

This service of the younger by the elder is also true in the intellectual world. All the knowledge acquired by past generations is made to serve present research. It is subordinated to it. Until recently it was the custom, when people sought authority for statements or theories, to go back to ancient times and try to find authority there. If you could find that somebody had said a thing in 4000 B.C., that was regarded, other things being equal, as proving it to be much more likely to be true than if someone had said it only a year ago. To-day we do not think so. If we were asked which is most likely to be the truest, the oldest or the newest, we should all say the newest. I remember my science teacher saying: 'Do not use a text-book which has been out for more than ten years.' This is due, of course, to the enormous advances in knowledge which are yearly taking place. We admire the great students and scientists of the past, but because their labours have constructed the foundations of our buildings, we know that our great men far surpass them in intellectual knowledge. Thus in the intellectual world do the elder serve the younger. Thus do the first become last, and the last first.

This way of looking at things has, of course, been greatly strengthened by our belief in evolution—emergent evolution—the conviction that the creative process is still proceeding and that it is ever bringing new things to pass. Our Golden Age is not in the past, but in the future. If we are ever foolish enough to complain, we do not complain that we were not born in the good old times, but in that better age in the future which all its predecessors will have helped to produce. As for our present age, it is always an age of transition.

Now this changed outlook—for it is not yet three generations old—has had its effect on our theology. It has produced what is called Modernism. Modernism is a term which fills old-fashioned people with horror and apprehension. They regard it as the latest heresy. It is really nothing of the kind. It will soon come to be recognized as the newest form of orthodoxy. But Modernism is something which has come about not as the result of this or that person's will; it is a movement which is

beyond the power of particular individuals to create or to destroy. It is a product of the creative process—what Christians will prefer to call a creative act of God. So it comes to us in the form of a great necessity. It demands our choice and our adhesion. Let me explain.

When, as a Christian, you look out on the Christian world to-day, with its five hundred million members, you might think that the great choice is whether you ought to be, shall we say, a Baptist, or a Wesleyan, or a Presbyterian, or an Anglican, or belong to some other of the many sects which call themselves Christian. Believe me, those choices are not great choices; they can hardly be said to refer to live issues. They refer to dying ones. After you have decided whether you will be a Pagan or a Christian, and have decided in favour of being a Christian, you are left with only three live issues. These are Romanism, Fundamentalism, and Modernism. Romanism, which believes in an infallible Church, guided by infallible General Councils, governed by infallible pontiffs. Fundamentalism, which believes in an infallible Bible, of which every statement is absolutely accurate and must be accepted as true by every Christian. Modernism, which believes in the spirit of Truth and Love seen in Jesus Christ, and which, in so far as we are loyal to it, will lead us upwards and onwards along the lines of true moral and spiritual progress.

This Modernist setting of the Spirit as an authority above the Church of the past and the ancient Scriptures is regarded by many as a most dangerous procedure. So it is. People, it is urged, may be so easily deceived about the guidance of the Spirit. When they are following their own carnal lusts and blind prejudices, they may claim that they are walking in the Spirit, and being led by the Spirit, as a Caroline satirist points out:

> 'For saints may do the same things by
> The Spirit in sincerity,
> As other men are tempted to
> And at the devil's instance do.'

Nevertheless, the rule of reason and conscience, the rule of right and truth, the rule of reverence and unselfishness can be recognized and relied on. 'By their fruits ye shall know them,' whether in personal character or in social life.

But it may be asked: Does not this Modernist claim that the Spirit is the supreme authority lead you away from Christ?

Why should it? It has not led the Quakers away. The Modernist cannot conceive of Christ's principles being surpassed. The experience of the last two thousand years has produced a growing impression of their indispensable value for human welfare and progress. Some may doubt whether they are practicable; none doubt that if they were practised human life would be much better and happier than it is.

This guidance of the Spirit which the Modernist claims as the supreme authority does not mean that he despises Bible and Church, but that in cases of conflict between ancient Church decrees and the Christian consciousness, or in cases of conflict between Scripture statements and the Christian consciousness, the Christian consciousness must be yielded to as the supreme authority.

These conflicts are constantly taking place, and these decisions are constantly being made. It is of no use to say to-day: 'This is in the Bible, and so you must believe it'; or 'This is a doctrine of the Church, therefore you must believe it.' We reply that that way of speaking might have been valid thirty years ago; to-day it no longer holds good. There is no need now to point out to you that there are a large number of Bible statements and Church doctrines which are no longer accepted by the Christian consciousness. For instance, no modern-minded Christian to-day believes in the damnation of unbaptized infants, or in the resurrection from the grave of the body buried in it. Yet these are Church doctrines of great authority and antiquity. No modern-minded Christian believes slavery to be permissible, although it is permitted in the New Testament. He believes that the Christian principles of love and freedom condemn slavery; and the Christian belief that God is our Father prohibits belief in the damnation of unbaptized infants. Some of us are conscious Modernists, some unconscious Modernists; but all who believe in the supreme authority of the Christian consciousness, enlightened by the Spirit of Christ, to decide what is true and right, even though such decisions may be contradicted by passages in the Bible, or by declarations of Church Councils and Fathers, are Modernists.

But the opponent of Modernism retorts: It is all very well to speak like this of Modernism, but nearly everything I hear about it asserts that Modernism is infidelity and agnosticism in

disguise; Modernism is negative and destructive; Modernism is 'high-browed' and intellectualist; Modernism is vague and indefinite; it is engaged in betraying 'the faith once for all delivered to the saints.'

It is true that Modernists do not believe in many things in which Christians in former ages have believed, and which some Christians believe still. These things seem to the Modernist to be legends, myths, superstitions, or dubious speculations. He does not view them as essentially Christian. Not only are they discredited in many cases by our vast advances in modern knowledge and modern ways of thinking, but they are also discredited by the developing Christian conscience. To reject these things is not to be negative or destructive; it is to act in obedience to that Spirit of Truth which Jesus promised when He said to His disciples, 'I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now; but when He, the Spirit of Truth, is come He shall guide you into all truth.'

But the worst of it is that these legends, myths, superstitions, and dubious speculations are discrediting the Christian religion in the minds of many educated people to-day, to their own great detriment, and to the detriment of the moral and spiritual life of the nation. It is hard enough to be a Christian to-day. The world and the flesh are always there to keep us back. It is a terrible thing for the Church as a teacher to add to these temptations by delaying to exercise that intelligent courage and energy by which truth is clearly separated from error and definitely rejected. No doubt it is not easy to do this; the issues are not always clear, and many old-fashioned people object strongly. On the other hand, there are the needs and claims of the rising generation. Shall youth knock in vain at the door of the most conservative of institutions? Surely not. Here also the elder must serve the younger. Beliefs of immemorial antiquity and authority, discredited by modern research, must be discarded, simply because 'new truth makes ancient good uncouth.' We know that at the English Reformation vast masses of error were rejected by our Church. It was a difficult and dangerous proceeding; it caused an Archbishop of Canterbury and four diocesan bishops to be burnt at the stake; but it performed great services to the English people, and gave us a position of leadership among the nations which we have held ever since the

spacious times of great Elizabeth. The time has come for another Reformation of religion. Indeed, we are now in the midst of it, and the spirit of the New Reformation is the spirit of Modernism, and my text is its motto : 'The elder shall serve the younger.'

We all know that there were evil aspects of that sixteenth century Reformation, particularly its terrible destructiveness of beautiful things and its cruel severity towards its opponents. The Modernist Movement is free from that spirit. It recognizes that love and reverence for beauty, like love and reverence for truth, and love and reverence for goodness, is one of the three lode-stars of humanity's progress from darkness to light. Equally, Modernism recognizes that violence and hatred cannot accomplish the Divine Will. The Modernist believes in evolution, not revolution, and so he believes in education as the only sound method of reform. Perhaps it is because Modernism believes in the educational method that it is charged with being intellectualist and 'high-browed.' I do not think it need trouble much about this charge, which is merely playing to the uneducated gallery.

The charges of negativeness and scepticism are more serious. In reply to this I would say that, whilst rejecting many things in traditional Christianity, Modernists believe that they hold fast all the essentials. For the Modernist, 'the truth as it is in Jesus' is a very simple and a very profound thing. It is that the highest unveiling we have of the Divine nature in human history is seen in the character and in the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

A few years ago I ventured to draw up a Modernist creed taken from the writings of St. John. I have never found an English Modernist who did not willingly adopt it. It runs thus :

We believe that God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.

We believe that God is Light, and that if we walk in the light as He is in the light we have fellowship one with another.

We believe that God is Love, and that everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God.

We believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son.

We believe that we are children of God, and that He hath given us of His Spirit.

We believe that if we confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.

We believe that the world passeth away and the lust thereof, but that he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever. *Amen.*

But let me put the Modernist position quite shortly in another form. Modernism has three great advantages in the appeal it makes to the younger generation.

First, Modernism satisfies the modern Christian's intellect by giving freedom of research.

Secondly, Modernism satisfies the modern Christian's conscience by giving freedom to teach the truth as he learns it.

Thirdly, Modernism satisfies the modern Christian's heart by admitting to Christian fellowship all who call Jesus Lord.

Let me give you one example of this. No Modernist would feel any objection whatsoever to receiving the Holy Communion with any fellow-Christian of whatever denomination. If the spirit of Modernism prevails, the barriers between the various Christian Churches will be broken down, and these Churches will be found in a few years' time working together, not in one organization, perhaps, but at least in one great federation. In this way Modernism promises to become the great reconciler, on the one hand, between Christianity and the New Learning, and, on the other, between the separatist Christian sects.

In the twelfth century there was a certain Christian mystic, Joachim of Flora, who, Dante sings, was endowed with the prophetic spirit. He taught that after the dispensation of the Father came the dispensation of the Son, and then last of all would come the dispensation of the Spirit, that Spirit of truth and love which is ever proceeding from the Father through the Son, and is by His creative energy ever making all things new. Those who have insight may see many indications of this to-day.

Now are we as individuals yielding to or are we resisting that Spirit? Take your church-life. When a man's eyes are first opened to the modern religious situation he is tempted to give up traditional Christianity. On second thoughts, he sees that though there is much error there is also much truth and value in traditional Christianity, and so he resolves to support it. This he does in a rather half-hearted way, because it is only half-true to him. Now if the spirit of Modernism has touched that man, he will say to himself: 'I can and will only support traditional Christianity on one condition, and that is that I do all I can to make it influential for good by purging it of its errors and falsehoods.' If that be your intention and practice, then you will be fulfilling the great principle of my text: 'The elder shall serve the younger.'

ST. PAUL'S THORN IN THE FLESH

By the Rev. R. V. G. Tasker, M.A., Domestic Chaplain to the late Bishop of Oxford.

THE world has many reasons to be grateful that II *Corinthians* secured a place in the canon of New Testament scripture, but perhaps for none so much as for the reference which that epistle makes to the physical affliction from which the Apostle suffered. We should never have guessed without its information that St. Paul was afflicted by an incurable disease of a somewhat virulent character which assailed him at different periods of his life. For we might have supposed that the illness, which he refers to in *Gal.* iv, 13 and 14, and which resulted in his prolonging his stay in Galatia and conducting further evangelistic work there, was only an illness of a temporary character which left no permanent bad results behind it and was not likely to be repeated. Throughout St. Paul's letters the impression which we get of the writer is of a wiry, eager, impetuous person, with a highly-strung nervous organization, but constitutionally robust and capable of making great mental and physical exertions and of suffering acute physical privations. It is only II *Cor.* which tells us that he was afflicted by a disease which he calls 'a thorn (or stake) in the flesh,' 'a messenger of Satan,' which seems to have visited him at certain intervals, for though he besought the Lord thrice that it might be taken from him, he was still liable to be attacked by it when he wrote this letter.

There is in human nature a strong curiosity, sometimes taking a rather morbid form, to know the exact nature of the diseases from which other people suffer; and when the sufferer in question is a person of conspicuous influence and importance, such curiosity is apt to be more eager than ever. We are not then surprised to find that from the earliest days numerous attempts have been made to try and probe the secret of this malady of St. Paul; and the very obscurity and metaphorical character of his reference to it have made the search more difficult and speculation more varied and fanciful. The value of such a search can quite easily be over-rated; for it is doubtful whether our general estimation of St. Paul or of the importance of his

work would be very much altered even if we were enabled to discover in detail the exact nature of his complaint. But the interest of such a search remains still as great as ever. Indeed, it is likely to become greater rather than less in these 'analytical' twentieth-century days.

We have assumed so far that St. Paul is in fact referring to a *disease* when he speaks of 'the thorn in the flesh' by which he was afflicted. It is worth noticing, however, that although such an assumption is almost universally made by modern students, it has not always been so. The earliest tradition on the subject, which dates back to the second century, seems to have regarded the words as a reference to some form of 'fever-headache'; but the early Fathers in general considered that the reference was really either to a personal enemy of St. Paul—Ephraem, for example, considered that the allusion is to Alexander the coppersmith, who is reported to have done Paul much evil (II *Tim.* iv, 14)—or else to the numerous persecutions which had the effect of humiliating the apostle. Medieval asceticism, with its fundamentally false view of human nature, its assumption that human instincts and in particular the sex instinct are in themselves evil, and its tendency to confuse temptation and sin, considered that 'the thorn in the flesh' was a metaphorical expression for sexual temptation. It is interesting to notice that neither the early fathers nor medieval Christian writers seem to have connected 'the thorn in the flesh' of II *Cor.* xii, 7, with the disease referred to in *Gal.* iv, 13, 14. Their views have rightly been regarded by modern writers as in the one case fanciful and in the other morbid and unnatural; and modern exegesis nearly always assumes that the 'thorn in the flesh' was a disease of the same character as that described in the passage of the Galatian letter. Numerous suggestions have been made as to its nature, of which the three most interesting and least improbable are acute myopia, malaria-fever, and some kind of epilepsy.

That the disease was some form of bad eyesight was the view adopted by Dr. Farrar almost entirely, it would seem, on the evidence of *Gal.* iv, 15, where St. Paul states that so sympathetic were the Galatians with him that 'they would have plucked out their eyes and given them to him,' and on the assumption that the conversion experience left permanent ill

effects behind it on the eyesight of the apostle. The view has seemed also to some to find support in the reference to the 'large letters' in which St. Paul says that he is writing at the end of *Galatians*. It would appear, however, much more probable that the reference to the sympathy of the Galatians is a metaphorical expression which has nothing to do with the character of the disease from which the apostle was then suffering; and the allusion to the 'large letters' may be equally well explained by the desire of the apostle to emphasize with as great clearness as possible certain statements in his letter as by the assumption that he was so short-sighted that he was obliged to write in a large handwriting. Moreover, from other passages in the Pauline letters and in *Acts* the impression we get is not that St. Paul suffered from bad sight, but, on the contrary, that his powers of vision were particularly keen and strong. The word ἀτενίζειν ('to fix the eyes upon'), which St. Luke uses several times in *Acts* to describe the gaze of St. Paul as he faced individuals and crowds, a word which only occurs in the New Testament in *Acts* and II *Cor.*, seems to imply very good eyesight, and would appear at any rate to be inconsistent with the idea that St. Paul suffered from weak or 'short' sight.

The view that St. Paul suffered from recurring attacks of malaria fever is strongly urged by Dr. Ramsey, who has given minute study to the question. He bases this conclusion upon three main considerations: that the disease was acutely painful, the 'stake in the flesh' (which Ramsey considers the correct translation) describing a sharp stabbing pain; that it was regarded by the Galatians as loathsome, though it was not necessarily accompanied by revolting physical phenomena; and that the reference to an 'angel of Satan' is a reference to a current description of malaria fever, which the inhabitants of Asia Minor regarded especially as a Satanic visitation.

There are, however, three considerations which lead us to hesitate to accept Ramsay's conclusions. First, the general trend of the passage in *Galatians* gives the impression that it was no familiar disease to which the Galatians were well accustomed which afflicted the apostle. Secondly, Ramsay's explanation does not give an adequate explanation of the language of *Gal.* iv, 14, which seems to refer to a disease which brought with it physical symptoms of a revolting character. 'What was a

temptation to you in my *flesh*,' the apostle writes, 'ye did not despise or reject' (lit. 'spit out') 'but ye received me as a messenger of God.' And, thirdly, malaria fever does not explain why the reference to the thorn in the flesh in II *Cor.* should be made in such direct connection with the reference to certain visions of a peculiarly ecstatic nature. 'And that I should not be unduly exalted by the excessive character of the revelations, *therefore* there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan, to buffet me' (II *Cor.* xii, 8).

It is the strong point about the theory that St. Paul suffered from some form of epilepsy that it does give an adequate explanation of all these three features. If we are right in referring the reference in *Galatians* to the same disease as the thorn in the flesh, two things seem to be quite clear about it. It was a disease which tended to attack the apostle in connexion with his more ecstatic visions, in which for the time being he would appear to have completely lost consciousness (this perhaps is the reason why he refers to the person who experienced them as 'a Man in Christ' when it is quite clearly himself whom he means, and which leads him in another place to say that at times he was 'beside himself'); and it was a disease which, temporarily at any rate, made him an object of considerable revulsion. Now it is well known that epileptics in many varying degrees and forms are subject to moments of great ecstatic rapture, which are followed by prostrating attacks which, with all their numerous and different symptoms, we call 'epileptic fits.' Are we then to assume that St. Paul was an epileptic? Ramsay pours scorn on any such conception. To him it is impossible that if this were the case St. Paul's visions could have 'revolutionized the world,' or that 'all that is best in it could have been built up on the dreams of epileptic insanity.'[1]

Upon reflection, however, it does not seem that these considerations of Ramsay are at all adequate in themselves to cause us to reject altogether any theory of epilepsy. For is it, we may well ask, in itself any more reasonable or probable that the greatest and fullest and final revelation of God should have been given through the son of a peasant woman of Galilee, as Christian tradition asserts, than that God should manifest Himself through other 'weak' instruments, even perhaps through the

[1] *Historical Commentary on Galatians*, p. 427.

visions of an epileptic? Have we any right to say that it is only through what we conceive to be purely normal and sane channels that contact between the human and the divine can take place? Does not psychology, moreover, tend to attach more and more importance to the truth revealed in the seemingly ridiculous dreams of ordinary people? Why then should the visions of one who at other times was perfectly normal contain any less truth because they happened to occur as the prelude to an epileptic attack?

But, whatever weight we may feel inclined to attach to these considerations, it is worth noticing that in point of fact St. Paul does not seem to attach nearly such a high value to these peculiarly ecstatic visions referred to in II *Cor.* as Ramsay imagines when he writes 'Paul regarded his visions as the crowning glory of his life, the sole source of his knowledge and his power.' If this were the case, why is it that St. Paul is very unwilling even to refer to them, except somewhat in self-defence as a counter-claim to the boastings of false apostles? And why is it that, having done so, he at once dismisses them and says that he prefers to boast of his weakness? These visions were of a different character to the experience of his conversion, to which he was always eager to refer, and it is true that that experience was the basis upon which his life as a Christian was built. It was then that it 'pleased God to reveal His Son in Him'; but St. Paul seems strangely loath even to refer at all to these other visions. Why was this the case if they were in reality the foundation of his religion? Is it not truer to say that St. Paul in reality attached no more importance to them than he did to such phenomena as 'speaking with tongues'? Both were equally ineffective as means for initiating others into divine truth, for you cannot convey to others 'unspeakable things which cannot be uttered.'

But apart from these two particular references in *Gal.* and II *Cor.* to his malady, are there really any signs that St. Paul could have been an epileptic? It is most important to realise that the term 'epileptic' is an extremely vague one. There are numerous forms and degrees of epilepsy, some wholly incapacitating, and some found in the most mentally and physically alert of men, even in those whom we call by that indefinable word 'genius.' Mild epilepsy in which fits occur comparatively rarely is of a very different nature from the many severer forms of the

disease. No one who is familiar with the life and writings of St. Paul would conclude that, if he was an epileptic at all, his epilepsy was anything more than the milder type. That is to say, there are no signs that St. Paul had any of the most common symptoms of the thorough-going epileptic. There was in him none of that vacillation, that instability of character, that lack of self-control, and that unpractical idealism, born solely of the imagination and never transferred into the region of practical politics, which are some of the commonest characteristics of the average 'epileptic.' St. Paul, although in many ways 'peculiar' and particularly prone to abnormal mystic experiences, was at the same time a practical statesman with shrewd common sense, always insisting on ethical and moral duties, without which religion was to him not worth the name. None who read, shall we say, the closing chapters of the *Epistle to the Romans* would be likely to assume that their writer was a sufferer from the severer forms of epilepsy.

On the other hand, the fact remains that St. Paul was peculiarly liable to sudden changes of temper, and that there was about him a wildness of disposition, which are at any rate consistent with the view that he was a mild epileptic. Such a view has the great merit of giving an explanation, which seems reasonable, of the language of the passages in the New Testament most pertinent to the subject. It is in no way inconsistent with the fact that St. Paul was a creative genius, for as one who has written fully on the subject reminds us, 'Very mild epilepsy, from one fit a year to one in several years, instead of hindering seems to help mentality, and many genius' have been epileptics.'[2] It is a view, moreover, which besides throwing light upon the strange terminology in which St. Paul himself refers to the complaint, also lends significance to the fact (though it is probably not the sole cause of it) that during a great part of his travels St. Paul was accompanied by Luke, 'the beloved physician'; and it tends to bring into greater relief St. Paul's own Christian philosophy of life, which may well have been influenced by it, and which he describes to us in the words 'strength is made perfect in weakness.'

More important, however, than the necessarily vague and speculative attempts to diagnose the exact nature of St. Paul's

[2] *Epilepsy, Hysteria and Neurasthenia.* Isaac G. Briggs (p. 125).

malady is the attempt to discover what was the attitude of mind which he adopted towards it and towards the problem of suffering in general. And perhaps there never was a time when more clear thinking upon this question was more necessary than at present. For contemporary Christian thought seems to be hopelessly in confusion as to what attitude a Christian should adopt towards the phenomenon of suffering. For many years past there has been a reaction gradually setting in against what may be called the conventional Christian view of suffering, a reaction which has been greatly increased by the widespread sufferings of the war. Fifty years ago the majority of Christians accepted the fact of suffering quite uncritically and submissively, attributing its presence to the will of God, who in some incomprehensible way was thought to be using it as the means by which He was achieving an ultimately beneficial purpose either for the human race or for individual men and women. Suffering was regarded largely as the discipline which God inflicted upon His children, and sometimes as the sign of the reality of His love towards them. It was the chastening rod, which chastened only that it might ultimately heal. To-day, however, men and women — and in particular those of the younger generation whose view of life was taking shape during the misery of war, and whose education has led them more and more to take a scientific view of the universe—are becoming increasingly dissatisfied with this attitude towards suffering, which seems to them to be true neither to the facts of experience nor to the New Testament, and which, in their view, presupposes a God of such a character that He would not appear to be deserving of worship or respect. Natural science is showing us increasingly that a great deal of the world's suffering is due, not to any direct divine intervention, but to the violation by mankind of certain definite natural laws, either in wilfulness or ignorance, a violation which never fails automatically to bring suffering in its train. Psychology is also revealing more and more clearly as the days go on that much of the mental unhappiness of man—which it must be recognized is of far greater intensity in civilized conditions of human life than physical pain—is due to such things as repressed instincts, unwise education, unwholesome environment, wrong early suggestion, which it is within the power of man himself to alter, and which

it is impossible to attribute directly to the will of God. It is seen, moreover, how great is the hardening effect which suffering on a large scale is apt to have not merely upon individuals, but upon communities. The suffering of the Great War, so far from having left a beneficent legacy behind it, has left cynicism and callousness, bitterness and resentment. And the result is that many people of our day will not and cannot regard suffering as being in accordance with the will of God. They would much rather regard it as an enemy which is thwarting God's plans and hindering His purposes for the world. And we cannot doubt that on the whole this tendency is a healthy one; for it is better that men should say of a great deal of the suffering of the world 'An enemy hath done this,' even though the enemy be their own stupidity or the ignorance of humanity in general, and that they should be stimulated thereby to wage warfare upon the many miseries which inflict the human race, than that they should meekly and submissively say 'It is the will of God' and not bestir themselves to overcome them. It would appear that Christ spent no inconsiderable part of His time in healing the sufferings of His fellow men, in binding up the broken-hearted, and in bringing release to those who were in physical and mental captivity. It is a fair assumption, moreover, from the New Testament story that He wished men to be happy as well as good; and we cannot forget that that volume ends with a vision of a world in which there shall be no more pain, but from which sorrow and sighing shall have fled away.

But that is only one side of the picture; and if it is pushed to extremes, as many would seem to wish to do to-day, it presents us with a Christian philosophy of life in which there is no place at all for such a thing as pain, which comes to be looked upon either as a delusion or as a completely unchristian thing: and it is at once obvious that such a conception is in conflict with much that is most conspicuous in the New Testament revelation.

The truth seems to be that just because the Christian religion is not a religion for a Utopian society living under ideal conditions in complete obedience to the laws of God, but a religion for men and women who are groping their way through the ignorance and darkness of centuries to the light of a very distant dawn, it *does* have a place in its philosophy for the fact of

pain, which Christian Scientists would try to tell us is a delusion, and regards it as fundamental that a right attitude of mind and spirit should be adopted towards it. At the very centre of its faith it therefore places a Cross—the symbol of pain—and it says to suffering humanity, as it stumbles over the barriers of its many mistakes, 'See how even suffering, itself an evil thing, capable if it is not rightly faced of doing the devil's work and not the work of God, can be used for the perfecting of human character'; and it holds up for the admiration of men as the ideal human life the life of one who made it His chief aim to make a perfect adaptation of heart and mind and will to the suffering which it was His lot to face. The life of Jesus is a tremendous paradox. On the one hand He seems largely occupied with healing sickness and sorrow, though it must be recognized that the accounts of His miraculous cures are probably not given us either with historical accuracy or in their proper proportion to other sides of His work; and on the other hand He calls His followers to adopt a way of life which will inevitably bring sorrow in its train, and He himself deliberately chooses the road which leads to Calvary. If we are right in regarding that life as not only a revelation of the nature of God, but also a revelation of perfect human life, then it would seem as if we must draw the paradoxical conclusion that suffering, where its causes are obvious and avoidable, should be regarded as the enemy of humanity; but that the most important concern of Christianity is that men and women should adopt a right mental attitude towards it, particularly in those many cases where the suffering of the individual in unavoidable. In other words, it is part of the function of Christianity to help men 'to suffer perfectly.' How far, we may go on to ask, is such a deduction true also to the revelation which St. Paul gives us in II *Corinthians* of his own attitude towards sickness and sorrow? Did he regard the thorn in the flesh from which he suffered as an evil or a beneficial thing? In itself he seems to have regarded it as an enemy. It was, he says, an 'angel of Satan,' and Satan signifies an aversary of God, for it is unlikely that St. Paul is using the word in the sense of the *Book of Job*, where Satan seems to be an emissary working ultimately on the side of God Himself. Thrice, moreover, the apostle tells us, he besought the Lord that this disease might be taken from him. So far his

attitude is one of direct opposition. But, as his prayer remained unanswered, he came to recognize that to take a merely negative attitude towards his suffering was in itself all unavailing; and his experience led him to see that as he lived more and more in close touch with his Lord, and endeavoured more and more to understand the secret of His life, he came to have the power of accepting his infliction willingly, and to see not only its harmful effects, which at one time alone seemed obvious, but also the beneficial results which this suffering might have for him. 'The grace of the Lord Jesus,' he says, 'was sufficient for him'; and his very weakness he came to look upon as the means by which his character was being advanced along the roadway of perfection. Even in pain and affliction God could be glorified, as He was glorified by Christ upon the Cross; and the apostle liked to think of the sufferings of himself and other Christians as making up what was lacking in the sufferings of Christ. He therefore gloried in his infirmities, not because they were infirmities, but because they were achieving beneficial results.

But in what directions did the apostle come to see that suffering could be a beneficial thing? How was his character developed and enriched by the many troubles and sorrows of his own life? In the first place it would appear from his own confession that he learned the greatness of true humility very largely through the fact of his suffering. He expressly tells us that his thorn in the flesh was sent him that he might not be over-exalted, and that he might learn that the humility of Jesus was made perfect in physical weakness. There is a common prejudice to-day against regarding Jesus solely as the Man of Sorrows. We are told that we have no right to suppose that He never smiled, or to think of Him as anything except a radiantly joyful figure living in the sunshine of His heavenly Father's love. The fact, however, remains that it was as the Man of Sorrows that He most impressed those who knew Him best. And it is perhaps just because He was the Man of Sorrows that He was, and could be, the perfect example of humility. For suffering may be the greatest antidote to overweaning pride and to that false mental and moral self-sufficiency which damages human character as much as anything else is likely to do.

And, secondly, St. Paul seems to have learned that suffering is the mother of sympathy. A painless world with humanity still in its present state of imperfection would beyond question be a world of unbridled selfishness. It is the fact of suffering which forces us to consider our neighbour's lot as well as our own. In the opening chapters of II *Corinthians* St. Paul seems to suggest that the whole purpose of the afflictions which have befallen him, and which he has been given the grace to endure, is that he himself may comfort others in their afflictions. St. Paul knew full well that it is almost impossible for one who has never suffered to have any real sympathy with other people. And here again St. Paul rightly interprets the life of Jesus, for it was the very intensity of His sufferings which made Him and makes Him still the perfect sympathizer.

And the third beneficial effect of suffering which St. Paul seems to have noticed is that it is very often the means of progress and the gateway to new life, even though it be life of a different kind. 'Christ was crucified of weakness, but the result is that He liveth of the power of God' (II *Cor.* xiii, 4). At first sight suffering seems the very enemy of all progress. It seems to thwart perhaps some individual life and to prevent it from achieving, on earth at any rate, its full and proper destiny; but at the same time history shows that mankind as a whole has very often progressed just because of the sufferings of individual men and women. The suffering of St. Paul, apart from the beneficial effects which it had upon himself and his own character, was the means by which the Christian churches of his time reaped great benefits and the influence of Christianity was spread. Without it the new religion might, humanly speaking, never have reached the Gentile world at all. St. Paul seems to have realized this when he says, 'We rejoice when we are weak and you are strong,' and when he tells the Corinthians that he 'humbles himself that they may be exalted' (xiii, 9, and xi, 7); and that 'he is ready to spend and be spent right out on their behalf' (xii, 15). It is the same truth which Tertullian expressed when he said that the 'blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church.' And there is a long roll of men and women in all departments of life whose sufferings have increased the happiness of their fellow-men. The paradox of Christianity seems to be that it is only through pain that pain

can be overcome. The very mistakes which mankind commits, and which never fail to bring suffering of some kind in their train, are meant to be the stepping-stones by which an ascent is possible to higher and better things in the light of increased wisdom learned at a high fee in the rough school of human experience.

It is perhaps not out of place to emphasize the importance of bearing these considerations in mind when we attempt to discover what attitude a Christian ought to adopt towards the question of Spiritual Healing, which is exercising the minds of so many people to-day. On the one hand it would appear that the general attitude which underlies the Spiritual Healing Movement is itself a healthy one, the attitude which regards suffering as a foe to be resisted wherever and whenever possible, and to be overcome by all available means, psychical as well as physical. On the other hand, it must be emphasized as strongly as possible that Christianity is concerned, and most vitally concerned, with the creating of the right mental and spiritual orientation to suffering in the individual sufferer, whether his sufferings be preventable or inevitable. There may be times when it is more Christian to help a person to make the right kind of submission to suffering than to try to foster an attitude of resentment towards it which may only result in adding further to his unhappiness. There are cases in which, to quote Dr. Creighton Miller, 'if we start with the assumption "It is God's will that you should be well and not ill," we risk establishing a phantasy of recovery which must necessarily preclude an adjustment to reality.'[3] The duty of the Christian Church and its ministers would seem to be clear in this matter. It is called upon to support with all the power it may possess all causes and movements, whatever their origin may be, which have as their object the alleviation of pain and suffering. In dealing with individual cases of suffering, however, it is not its primary duty to try and do the doctor's work, or to give the impression 'that the Sacraments are a substitute for a bottle of medicine'; but to enable individual sufferers to make the right kind of mental and spiritual orientation towards their particular suffering. This will necessarily vary in different cases. Sometimes it will be necessary to try and call forth an attitude of

[3] *The New Psychology and the Preacher*, p. 272.

calm trust and peaceful resignation; sometimes an attitude of hopeful and cheerful and confident hostility; and sometimes, in cases where the suffering is more imagined than real, the Christian Science attitude of treating the particular suffering as in reality a delusion. It is, however, of the first importance that all who have the welfare of a sufferer at heart should be agreed as to the attitude which it is desirable to try and create. Nothing can be more harmful than that the parson, for example, should be filling the mind of a sufferer with thoughts of death while the doctor is trying his best to exclude any such conception from the thoughts of his patient. A case is known to the writer in which a patient who was suffering from an acute organic nervous disease was persuaded, somewhat against her desire, by a priest to receive the Holy Communion, a service which, it must be confessed, too many clergy to-day are apt to regard as an end in itself instead of a means to an end. It seems to have been fundamental to the religion of the clergyman in question that such communion should be received fasting, for he insisted on arriving at 8.45 a.m. to pay his visit. The patient, after having spent an almost sleepless night in nervous anticipation, was then given a service which, including the time that it took for the clergyman to rig up a portable altar and to give an address, lasted three-quarters of an hour, and was informed before the priest left her that she was 'now ready for death'! The comments of the doctor who came subsequently to treat the patient when he heard of this incident are unprintable; but the story does show how easy and how justifiable it is that the medical profession should sometimes regard with scorn the co-operation of the Christian ministry in dealing with disease, though they are as a rule only too willing to welcome the help of sensible and broad-minded men who have not allowed their mental horizon to be confined by some narrowly ecclesiastical conception. The problem of suffering is indeed too big for any one class of men to tackle or to hope to solve alone. It is for this very reason that Luke the physician and Paul the minister of Christ Jesus must work together in dealing with the numerous thorns in the flesh which afflict mankind.

THE PRESENT STATE OF OLD TESTAMENT STUDY

By the Rev. F. L. Cross, M.A., B.Sc., Chaplain and Tutor of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

THAT the study of the Old Testament has entered a new phase is quite evident to anyone acquainted with the literature of the subject. The position which had been reached at the beginning of this century, or even earlier, was tending to develop into a 'critical orthodoxy,' and, though there were vigorous attacks from time to time on the critical view of 'the problem of the Old Testament,'[1] there was general agreement among scholars that the really fundamental problems had been solved. The main work of the Biblical student who was not a professed specialist was to become acquainted with a widely-accepted theory of Old Testament development and its proofs, unaware that by so doing he was but following in the method of study which his forefathers had adopted for generations, except that they usually had a knowledge of the text as well as of the literature about it. It appears now that this state of critical lethargy is destined rapidly to pass away. Several facts have awakened us, and many of the theses of the new orthodoxy have been subjected to severe criticism in consequence.

One of the most important of these facts is the recent revival of interest in German scholarship. Germany has, indeed, led the way for at least a century in this field of research. It is only necessary to recall the names of Ewald, of Wellhausen, of Winckler, to single out three of those known to all modern students of the Bible. But it must not be supposed that English scholars have followed blindly the theories put forward by German theologians. Our learning has always been characterized by soberness and saneness, two virtues which have not infrequently been sacrificed by our Continental friends to a striving after originality. Consequently the best Old Testament scholarship of the last century (notably in the case of S. R.

[1] The phrase is the title of Professor Orr's well-known defence of the traditional views.

Driver[2]) maintained in England an attitude of reasonable caution, accepting continental views only when the traditional theories seemed quite impossible; and, through the adoption of this attitude, our scholars rendered a very valuable service by presenting to English readers the 'assured results' of German criticism in a form which had been thoroughly tested; and so prepared the way for their acceptance by what our neighbours have chosen to call the conservative English mind. As was inevitable, this influence of German theology ceased during the War and remained negligible in the years which immediately followed that catastrophe. But within the last two or three years there has come about a rapid revival of interest in German Old Testament criticism at least as great as that which prevailed before the War.

More remarkable, and quite new, is a growth of interest in English Old Testament scholarship in Germany. In the sphere of theology, we have till recently seldom been even criticized by German scholars; they were acquainted with but little of our work, and then generally only with that of the editors of texts less easily accessible in their own language. Many of our foremost scholars were never even heard of.[3] But all this has changed. The note was sounded in 1924 by Gressmann in the admirable article with which he opened the new series of the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*,[4] of which he is now the editor. He writes:

> 'My lack of knowledge of foreign literature weighs heavily on my soul; it may in part be excused by the War, which has even yet not come to an end; at any rate, I would wish to emphasize clearly that it is not intentional. Against (such ignorance) the *ZATW* will and must assist, in order that the investigators of all peoples, in their wrestings with the deepest problems, do not pass one another by, but that, acknowledging every serious achievement, learn with and from each other; as far as possible, it (the *ZATW*) will contribute its share, in order that the gulf between the nations may again be bridged over by that common love towards the Old Testament and by that striving after truth which we all possess.'

The editor has fulfilled his intentions very successfully. He has published several articles (in English) by English scholars[5]

[2] He has been referred to by German writers as *der vorsichtige Driver*.

[3] I think this is true. My conclusion is based upon the complete lack of references to English work which prevailed in their writings.

[4] '*Die Aufgaben der alttestamentlichen Forschung.*' *ZATW*. N.F.I. (1924), pp. 1-33.

[5] *e.g.*, G. A. Cooke, M. A. Canney, A. C. Welch, T. H. Robinson, W. L. Wardle.

in its pages, as well as some French contributions. English books are reviewed in a way in which they never have been before. And it is clear that we may look forward to a period of close co-operation between English and German Biblical scholarship.

It is not surprising that the English study of the Old Testament has been greatly stimulated. We have, indeed, to deplore the recent loss of a large number of those in its foremost ranks—to mention only the names of Abrahams, Burney, Buchanan Gray, and Skinner—and there is need for a younger generation to attempt, as far as possible, to replace them. Such a generation is arising, or rather has arisen; and if productivity of ideas and the number of pages published be the test, there could be no doubt as to its adequacy to the task set before it. The remainder of this article will be devoted to some account of two first-rate works which contain contributions from some of these scholars, and will seek to illustrate from here and elsewhere certain aspects of present-day Old Testament criticism.

It is seldom that collective work succeeds in maintaining such a high standard of accuracy, completeness, interest and value as does *The People and the Book*.[6] This is no doubt largely due to the efficient editorial hands to which the work was entrusted. On one occasion, Professor Peake remarked that he believed that there was a special place reserved in heaven for editors; and, if he was right, there can certainly be no doubt as to his own future prospects. The book contains fifteen essays; but, in spite of their complete independence, they are not a haphazard selection. It is clear that the book was carefully planned, and then suitable contributions for each of the subjects drawn from the ranks of the Old Testament Society. As that Society numbers among its members nearly all the leading English Old Testament scholars, and as there was no attempt made to secure uniformity of views in all the contributors, the book may fairly be regarded as representative of the best English scholarship. The book, which is published

[6] *The People and the Book*. Essays on the Old Testament, contributed by H. R. Hall, S. A. Cook, G. R. Driver, A. C. Welch, T. H. Robinson, J. E. McFadyen, W. F. Lofthouse, A. S. Peake, W. E. Barnes, W. O. E. Oesterley, H. W. Robinson, R. H. Kennett, I. Abrahams, G. H. Box, G. Buchanan Gray. Edited by A. S. Peake. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. Price 10/-.

by the Clarendon Press, can claim to rank (and perhaps is intended to rank) with the excellent *Legacy of Rome*, and the still more excellent *Legacy of Greece*, which have recently issued from that press. For, though but one essay is devoted solely to that theme,[7] yet the whole work is a source of information from which it is possible to appreciate Israel's legacy to our modern civilization.

The book is hardly suitable for the beginner, who would find it somewhat above his powers. Even for the student possessed with what passes to-day as a fair acquaintance with the Old Testament, it is at times not easy reading. On every page there is a multitude of facts; the contributors, in their desire to give as much information as possible, never waste their words. Consequently there is frequently a certain harshness of style, though some of the essays are altogether free from this reproach. The attention paid to new theories is somewhat disproportionate from the standpoint of those not acquainted with the usual theories; but for the student this is a decided gain. Many a man has finished his University or theological college career with an excellent knowledge of the then current views on Old Testament criticism and never read a book on the subject since. For such, *The People and the Book* should be a very great and profitable stimulant.

Throughout, the book is an inspiration to wider reading. It would appear that many of the writers must have had this goal consciously in view. Besides possessing a bibliography, it gives a large number of accurate references to current literature which frequently stimulate in the reader a desire to see the source for himself. Nearly all the literature so referred to is quite modern; the beginner especially would need to be warned that it is more important to read Wellhausen than Hölscher, to read Robertson Smith than Gressmann. But for him who knows his Wellhausen and his Robertson Smith, Hölscher and Gressman prove to be essential safeguards, if not correctors.

We do not propose to summarize the articles in turn; that would be quite impossible, if for no other reason than that they are themselves summaries. Nor can we aim at giving an account of their contents; the editor has done that for us in the preface. Only a few remarks will be offered on some of them. The

[7] Essay XII, by Professor R. H. Kenett.

opening essay, by Dr. Hall of the British Museum, is one of the longest, and, we must add, most difficult. He discusses the relation of Israel to the surrounding nations. It is a mine of information (as pages on this subject often are), but it is particularly difficult reading, and we fear that it may repel many from advancing further into the book. It is unfortunate that this contribution could not have found a place further on in the volume, when its readers had been better prepared for such strong meat. The second article, by Dr. S. A. Cook, treats of the relationship of Israel to its neighbours from the religious point of view. One of its chief merits is that the illustrations are chosen from unusual sources; there is no suggestion here (as there very frequently is in such essays) that the author has used a *catena parallelorum* rather than had recourse to the original texts. The next two essays, by Mr. G. R. Driver and Professor A. C. Welch, treat of the Hebrew language and Hebrew history respectively. Essay V, on 'The Methods of Higher Criticism,' by Dr. T. H. Robinson, is well done, though it appears intended for less advanced readers than the other essays. The next essay, on the present state of Old Testament criticism, by Professor McFadyen, is necessarily somewhat sketchy in parts; but the author has had a difficult task to include all that is of importance. If he sometimes leaves us in doubt on what basis his conclusions are built, he invariably puts us on the track so that we can discover them for ourselves. Four essays (VII-X) follow which deal with Hebrew Religion; that of Professor W. E. Barnes hardly comes up to the standard of the other three. Essay XI, by Professor Wheeler Robinson, deals with Hebrew psychology. The essay contains a good discussion of the use of the words *nephesh*, *ruach*, and *leb*. In fact, the whole essay is devoted to the way in which the Hebrews conceived the *structure* of their minds rather than with those unconscious elements in their mental make-up which necessarily determined their ideals and their *Weltanschauungen*. This problem is highly important and might well have been treated in another essay with the same title; what appears to be obvious borrowing from other Semitic sources is doubtless often to be explained by the common elements in all Semitic psychology. The remaining three essays look beyond the Old Testament as it stands, dealing with the contribution of the Old Testament to

the religious development of mankind, Jewish interpretation of the Old Testament,[8] and the value and significance of the Old Testament in relation to the New. The volume concludes with a hitherto unpublished and incomplete paper of the late Buchanan Gray which is hardly up to the level of his other published writings.

The other work to which we desire here to direct attention is planned on a much greater scale, and is still in its beginnings. As yet, only three volumes of *The Cambridge Ancient History*[9] have been published; it is intended that there shall be nine volumes in all, and that the history shall be carried down to 324 A.D. But in the three volumes which have appeared are probably to be found the contributions which deal most directly with the Old Testament. These are mainly by Dr. S. A. Cook, who is one of the editors of the whole work; the very fact of their occurrence in a volume dealing with the whole of ancient history gives to the student that sense of proportion which it is so difficult for those exclusively occupied with the study of Israelite religion to secure. In the first volume, entitled 'Egypt and Babylon up to 1580 B.C., chapters iv and v deal exclusively with Old Testament themes. To the next volume, which carries the history down to the early monarchy period under the title 'The Egyptian and Hittite Empires to 1000 B.C.,' Dr. Cook contributes chapters on 'Syria and Palestine in the light of external evidence' (ch. xiii) and 'The rise of Israel' (ch. xiv). In the third volume, there is the greatest number of pages bearing directly upon the Old Testament; the article on the topography of Jerusalem is by a particularly competent authority, Professor Stewart Macalister. The work is a first-class production.

What are the outstanding features of recent Old Testament study with which these volumes present us? To take a concrete instance, what do they tell us about Moses?

The view that Moses was a definite historic character appears now to be generally accepted. Völter, indeed, has

[8] This essay, by the late Mr. Israel Abrahams, contains much information usually known only to the specialist.

[9] Published by the Cambridge University Press. Edited by J. B. Bury, M.A., F.B.A.; S. A. Cook, Litt.D.; F. E. Adcock, M.A. Vol. I, 1923; vol. II, 1924; vol. III, 1925. The preface to the last volume informs us that 'it is expected that vol. IV will be published early in 1926' (p. ix). The price of each volume is 35/-.

attempted to resuscitate doubts as to his existence and maintained that he is only a mythological character, the product of Egyptian traditions.[10] Sellin replies decisively[11]:

> 'Not only the sharply-defined character-sketch which the story gives of him,—a man of iron energy, of passion, even of hasty anger (cp. *Ex.* ii, 11*ff*, xxxii, 19, 26*ff*; *Numb.* xi, 11*ff*, xxv, 1*ff*), whereas the later tradition reversed this trait and made him the meekest of all men (*Numb.* xii, 3, *Is.* liii, 7),—not only his Egyptian name (Son of Mes; the name of a god which preceded has perhaps been obliterated by the tradition), which legend would never have invented of its own accord for the founder of the religion, but, before all, his whole work, the salvation of oppressed shepherds and the foundation of a new religion, witness clearly to the actual existence of a powerful personality, which must necessarily have been constructed if the story had not related it of him.'

Moses, then, may be regarded as an historic person. But, having decided this question, there is room for, and in fact there is, the widest diversity of opinion as to the part which he played in the development of Hebrew religion, and as to how he played it. This accounts for that considerable list of monographs on him which have comparatively recently appeared.[12] We shall confine ourselves to the consideration here of some modern views on (*a*) the date of Moses, (*b*) the religion of Moses, and (*c*) the Deuteronomic legislation, traditionally ascribed to Moses.

(*a*) In the attempt to answer the question of the date of Moses, the opinions which still divide scholars about the Tell el-Amarna letters may claim to be the most important factor. These letters, it will be remembered, deal largely with the incursions of peoples, among whom were the Habiru, into Palestine about the beginning of the fourteenth century before Christ. There is fairly general agreement now that the Habiru are to be equated with the Hebrews[13]; and it might therefore be expected that, by identifying the tribal movements of both peoples, some light might be thrown on the absolute dating of the earlier Israelite traditions. The task proves, however, much more difficult than appears on the surface, for there is considerable difference of opinion as to which Old Testament events are paralleled in the Amarna letters. Some critics, notably

[10] *Wer war Mose?* (1913).

[11] E. Sellin: *Geschicte des israelitisch-jüdischen Volkes.* (Leipsig, 1924.) Page 79.

[12] The names of their authors are given in *The People and the Book*, p. 221.

[13] This is denied, however, by Père Dhorme. Quoted *J.T.S.*, March 1925, p. 334.

Burney[14] and Sellin,[15] assert with confidence that the incursions of the Habiru are to be identified with one or other of the patriarchal migrations related in *Genesis*, *e.g.*, of Isaac or of Jacob; others[16] assert with equal confidence that they refer to the entry into Canaan under Joshua. Correspondingly, of course, we arrive at two quite different dates for Moses. Those who accept the former view generally put the date of the Exodus at the time of the Pharoah, Mineptah (1225-1215). Those who accept the latter view follow Josephus and identify it with the expulsion of the Hyksos (1580). This view has the additional advantage that it accords more nearly with the Biblical chronology than the other; though it must be admitted that it is probably that of the minority of those competent to judge. There is thus room for a divergence of nearly four centuries as regards the date of Moses.

(*b*) *Monotheism.* The recent tendency has been to believe that Moses' ideas about God were not so far removed from those which have been traditionally ascribed to him. Mr. W. L. Wardle,[17] among others,[18] believes that monotheism in Israel goes back to the time of the revelation on Mount Sinai. Here, of course, he differs from the customary critical view, which sees the first clear glimmerings of monotheism in the prophet Amos. That prophet, we are told, saw as none of his predecessors had done that Jahweh was capable of bringing up the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir, as well as the Israelites from Egypt[19]; by so doing he burst the bonds by which the Jahweh religion in Palestine in earlier times had been fettered. But Wardle doubts whether Amos was really such an innovator. The prophet's task is not the setting forth of a new conception of God, but the reiteration of forgotten or neglected teaching. The prophets 'certainly on the whole do not speak as if they

[14] *Israel's Settlement in Canaan* (Schweich Lectures for 1917, p. 63*ff*).
[15] *Op. cit.*, p. 57.
[16] *e.g.*, H. R. Hall, in *The People and the Book*, Essay I.
[17] In an article in the *ZATW*, 1925, pp. 193-209, and in *Israel and Babylon*. This book (published by the Holborn Publishing House, 1923, price 5/-) is a useful summary of current views on the subject of Israel's relation to Babylonian thought. It possesses what might have been a valuable bibliography; it is marred by the omission of the dates of publication of the works enumerated.
[18] *e.g.*, Baentsch.
[19] *Amos* ix, 7.

had recently made the discovery that there was but one God.' [20]

> 'They preached a return to the past. They considered themselves restorers and reformers.' [21] 'The accepted view,' according to Wardle, 'took its shape under the dominating influence of the doctrine of evolution, at a time when the tendency was to think of evolution as taking place almost exclusively by means of small variations. Since then it has been recognized that sudden springs, and also retrogressions, have played a much more prominent part in the scheme of evolution than had been allotted them by the earlier theorists.' [22]

There is, indeed, every reason to suppose that monotheism should be carried back much further than the time of Amos. We must, however, avoid the temptation to seek its origin either in Egypt or in Babylon; that the alleged early monotheism of these civilizations exercised any appreciable influence on Hebrew thought Wardle rightly questions. Hebrew monotheism differed in kind from that of its neighbours. Gressmann, who holds the same view,[23] puts the case well:

> 'Through Moses, Israel passed over from polytheism to monotheism, but the monotheism remained at first of a practical kind. It remained monolatry until it was theoretically thought out by the great prophets, and so became deepened into fundamental (*principiellen*) monotheism.'

(*c*) *The Deuteronomic Code.* Recent criticism has questioned two hypotheses, the one of which has been held fairly generally for somewhat over a century, the other of which has been unquestioned for two milleniums.

The first of these is the theory associated with the name of De Wette. It maintains that *Deuteronomy* is a work of the seventh century before Christ, and that the finding of this code of laws in the Temple in 621 was the immediate occasion of the reforms of Josiah, recorded in II *Kings* xxii, xxiii. This view has become so familiar to students of the Old Testament that it is difficult to read *Deuteronomy* without seeing allusions at every turn to those reforms. We can, however, no longer regard this as so certain as we could a few years ago. The hypothesis has been severely questioned from two quite opposite standpoints. One writer[24] opposes it on the ground that the book presupposes social and religious conditions which were prevalent in Palestine several centuries earlier than the time of Josiah;

[20] Wardle, *op. cit.*, p. 114.
[21] Causse, quoted Wardle, *ibid.*, p. 114.
[22] Wardle, *ibid.*, p. 112.
[23] *Mose und seine Zeit*, p. 447.
[24] Prof. A. C. Welch of Edinburgh.

another,[25] on the ground that it presupposes conditions such as never existed in Palestine at any time, and consequently is the work of a Jew writing at the time of the Exile, and unable to conceive what the actual state of things in Palestine would have demanded. Both agree that the conditions for which *Deuteronomy* legislated were not those of the time of Josiah.

The former theory is championed by Professor A. C. Welch in a volume published nearly two years ago.[26] He is concerned mainly with the core of *Deuteronomy* (*i.e.*, chapters xii-xxvi and xxviii). Not only does he assert that it was a product of a much earlier period than the time of Josiah, but he questions the meaning which has been assigned from at any rate the fifth century B.C. to the phrase 'the place which Jahweh thy God shall choose.' This, we are told, refers not to Jerusalem in particular, but to any Jahweh sanctuary in the land. In fact, the only passage where centralization is insisted upon is in xii, 1-7. Elsewhere, when we read that the place of worship and other tribal functions was to be a place which Jahweh should choose, the stress is always to be laid on the fact that it shall be a Jahweh, and not a Baal, sanctuary. On the usual theory, the account of the Passover ritual is particularly inexplicable. Apart from the celebration at the time of Josiah, there is no evidence that at Jerusalem alone could the rite take place. 'Passover had never before been celebrated at the central sanctuary, and it was never so celebrated again.'[27] The legislation in *Deut.* xvi provided for the celebration at the local shrines, as appears to have been the primitive custom; and later, even when the centralization of the worship came about, the Passover still remained a local feast. To render this possible, it was necessary to change the custom from a meal at the sanctuary to a meal at one's own home; and, of course, this is what (Welch tells us) the priestly legislation provided for.

[25] Prof. G. Hölscher of Marburg.

[26] *The Code of Deuteronomy.* (London: James Clarke and Co., 1924). Price 6/-.

[27] Welch, *op. cit.*, p. 71. Canon Harford (*'Since Wellhausen,'* pp. 113*f*) justly asks, 'How does he know?' and refers to *Ezra* vi, 19-22, and II *Chron.* 30 and 35. Even if the statements of the Chronicler cannot claim to be historically accurate, they at least prove the existence of a tradition of Passover celebrations at the Judaean capital. On the other hand, the Passover *may* very well have been celebrated at the local sanctuaries in early times; of this, the celebration on Mount Gerizim would be a survival (*cp.* Welch, *op. cit.*, pp. 74*ff*).

Again, the attitude to the prophets taken up in this book is essentially incompatible with the conditions extant in the sixth century. *Deuteronomy* presupposes that the prophets were a class which stood in no high repute; the would-be Jahweh worshippers had to be informed how they could discriminate between false and true prophets. To draw up actual tests was by no means an easy task. In so far as their function was to predict, a fairly obvious test was whether or not their prophecies were actually fulfilled (xviii, 22). But, needless to say, this test could only be applied in cases where their work was predictive, as was certainly not usually the case. For other cases, the means of discrimination were very definite (*cp.* ch. xiii, 1-5). 'It is no far-fetched conclusion that, since the Deuteronomic code is still willing and eager to include the prophetic office as a living authority in Israel, and since it can supply no precise test for its sincerity, it belongs to the period when the institution had not yet arrived. The legislation dates in the period of the early kingdom.'[28]

We cannot discuss the theory further. It necessitates, as has been pointed out, the separation of xii, 1-7 from the rest of the Code. These verses, we are told, 'form a little unity which is entirely unconnected with what precedes and with what follows.'[29] But this is not the first time that words to that effect have been used by those about to resort to the critical knife. It is essential to examine the text for oneself and then to consider the worth of the arguments to be found on pages 55*ff*. The least that can be said is that there is no objection to making a division between verses 7 and 8.[30] Here we must leave the question.

Mention, if no more, must be made of Hölscher's theory.[31] The book of *Deuteronomy* contains such thoroughly 'impractic-

[28] Welch, *op. cit.*, p. 113.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 193.

[30] The change from the plural ('you') to the singular ('thou') form of address occurs at verse 12. On the basis of such changes of number, Steuernagel attempted to isolate two sources which lay behind *Deuteronomy*. Welch admits another break at verse 12; but his theory would have been greatly strengthened if the change had come at verse 7.

[31] His theory respecting *Deuteronomy* is to be found in the *ZATW*, 1922, pp. 161-255. His theories on *Ezekiel* were also developed in that journal. For his views on II *Kings* reference must be made to the Gunkel *Festschrift*, entitled Εὐχαριστήριον (Göttingen, 1923), Bd. I, pp. 158-213.

able idealism' that it can only be the work of an Exilic writer. We are reminded at once of Ezekiel's reconstruction, as depicted in chapters 40 to 48; and we might expect that Hölscher would have treated the two idealist priestly-prophetic writers as contemporaries. But no. With his hypothesis about *Deuteronomy* are bound up theories which necessitate the re-dating of much of the Old Testament literature. Thus, the *E* source, which most scholars now believe is not confined to the Hexateuch, continues through the books of *Kings* and is no eighth century document. The book of *Ezekiel* is in the main the work, not of the genuine prophet (to whom only a small proportion of the work is attributed), but of a writer at least a century later than the time of the Exile. When so much of the literature needs re-dating, we may well wonder whether the ground is not swept away from the objections which Hölscher believes necessitate a new date for *Deuteronomy*.

But, in spite of Welch and Hölscher, the traditional theory still has its advocates. In a series of articles in the *Expositor* for 1925,[32] Canon Battersby Harford defends as the date for the Deuteronomic legislation the period immediately preceding King Josiah's reformation. One of the most serious objections urged against Welch's arguments arises from his interpretation of the expression, 'the place which Jahweh thy God shall choose.' 'I can,' writes Canon Harford,[33] 'find no adequate parallel case in which a noun followed by a defining relative clause of this type can be treated as standing for one of a class.' Here, as elsewhere, these six essays at least show the need for caution, and constitute, as Professor Moffatt asserts in a prefatory note to the collection, 'a real contribution to the subject of Old Testament criticism.' We can recommend them heartily to those who desire a clear and succinct criticism of the various attempts to overthrow the positions upheld by Wellhausen.

[32] Reprinted under the title *Since Wellhausen: A Brief Survey of Recent Pentateuchal Criticism*. Obtainable from Basil Blackwell, Oxford. Pp. 144. Price 2/-.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 108.

THE WORLD CALL TO THE CHURCH

By Archdeacon Beresford Potter.

IN his Preface to these four Reports[1] the Bishop of Salisbury, Chairman of the Missionary Council, recognizes the principle that missionary work should emanate from different schools of thought within the Church.

> 'The whole-hearted interchange of knowledge, and experience, and the general endeavour to co-operate in spite of our differences, in presenting a common front to the non-Christian world is one of the great steps which our generation is making towards the re-union of Christendom.'

If it be found essential at home, in order to maintain and strengthen Christian influence, that the three main schools of Christian thought should each present its side of the truth, it is surely equally necessary that this should be so in missionary efforts. There is an increasing number of Modernists working in Anglican missions abroad. But in certain cases the atmosphere of the chief missionary societies has proved unable to welcome Modernist teaching, and this has led to the resignation of leading missionaries. Yet the report on India contains the following significant statement when dealing with the influence of Christianity on the *intelligentsia* of the country.

> 'Considering the extent and variety of the missionary forces concentrated on the work among the *intelligentsia*, during the last hundred years, the number of converts is disappointingly small. Large numbers of colleges and high-schools have been established, mainly with a view to carry out the policy of converting to Christianity by education saturated with the Bible, and the Anglican missionaries engaged in this work have been men of great ability, devotion, and force of character, mainly connected with C.M.S. and S.P.G., yet there has been little fruit so far as converts are concerned. The effect, however, that has been produced is, undoubtedly, a widespread knowledge of the life and teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ. There is abundant evidence from all parts of India of the respect, and even reverence, that is felt by the educated Hindoos and Moslems for the person of Christ. Educated Indians, while declining to associate themselves with the Christian Church, are looking more and more to Christ as the fount of their ideals and the source of their moral strength.'

[1] *The Call from the Far East*, 3/- net; *The Call from India*, 2/6 net; *The Call from Africa*, 2/6 net; *The Call from the Moslem World*, 2/6 net. Published by the Publications Board of the Church Assembly, Church House, Westminster (1926).

I recollect Bishop French of Lahore, writing to me in 1879, saying how very important it was in India to have clergymen of high intellectual attainments to deal with the Indian educated class. This is insisted on in the Report :

> 'Whether we think of men and women doctors, or of teachers for the colleges and high-schools, or of educationalists for the mass-movement areas, everywhere in India the call is for the very highest that England can give; the appeal is for the best men and women that our universities and hospitals can supply. It is the influence of Christian personality that is most effective, and this personality demands the best intellectual equipment. In the centres of higher education, it is only those that have taken good degrees that are fitted for the posts.',

In *The Call from the Moslem World* we find the demand repeated for missionaries of high intelligence :

> 'The situation calls for more real experts on Islam. Such a man must be of outstanding ability. He must be soaked in Moslem thought, theology, traditions and history.'

It speaks of the need of 'new methods of work, a new literature of Christian doctrine suitable for Moslems, new co-operative efforts by all missionaries of different societies, in the face of a common task.' Most rightly does the *Call* declare that

> 'Christian missionary work is not the compassing of Heaven and earth to make one proselyte, but the humble and sincere presentation to Moslem seekers after truth of Christ as the real answer to their search. Missionary work is not the attacking of another faith, but the enriching of it. Our policy in Moslem lands must be one of sympathy with all that is best in Islam.'

As in England a large number of ordinands are either non-graduates, or, if graduates, only pass men; and, at the same time, there are some high-class graduates of Modernist views in the mission field, who could win the educated non-Christians to membership of the Christian Church; it is unfortunate if these men are hindered from within, because they are expected to teach a kind of Christianity which the *intelligentsia* will not accept.

There are doubtless in the minds of educated non-Christians the same kind of difficulties in regard to Traditionalist Christianity as have arisen among ourselves. These difficulties we do not regard as due to 'an evil heart of unbelief,' nor to the Gospel of Jesus being untrue, but as being due in many cases to a presentation of that Gospel which is out of date, and discredited by modern research, and to modes of thinking which have been

abandoned by the educated modern world. Some time ago an article appeared in a well-known English magazine, in which a highly-educated Moslem stated that he entirely agreed with the teaching of Jesus Christ, but he thought that St. Paul had spoiled Christianity by introducing into it the Jewish conceptions in which he had been brought up. The Traditionalist denies this, but the Modernist admits that there is much to be said for the Mohammedan's contention. And in making this admission he runs the risk of being charged with betraying the Faith.

A native student at Tokio told me that he was carefully studying the different religions around him, Buddhism, Shintoism, Mohammedanism, and Christianity, and that he was resolved to adopt that one which seemed to him most consistent with reason, science, and experience. Unless therefore the Christian missionary can present the Christian religion as able to endure this test, it is obvious that such a man will not become a Christian.

The question arises whether the comparative failure to convert the *intelligentsia* to membership in the Christian Church has been due in some measure to the absence in the missionary of the Modernist spirit. Our missionary authorities will do well to weigh that question.

That part of the Indian Report which deals with the 'response of the outcasts' is vastly more encouraging than that which deals with the *intelligentsia*.

> 'These people, about fifty millions in number, are sweepers, scavengers and leather workers, carrying on occupations regarded as unclean by the Hindoo religion. Before British rule they were slaves bought and sold with the land, beaten by their master with no redress, branded by the caste-men as untouchables, not allowed to use the village wells, or send their children to the public schools, or, in some parts of India, to come within forty yards of a high caste man.'

These outcasts have responded wonderfully to the Christian call.

> 'They have come in by thousands, and tens of thousands in the last fifty years to the Christian Church; and have afterwards, "wonderful to narrate," become missionaries among the higher castes.'

Bishop Azariah, the first Indian bishop in the Anglican Communion, gives an instance of the transformation effected in one village:

> 'Originally poverty was written on the face of all. Rags, only, covered their bodies. They had no land, no cattle, and were in debt

to the landlords. Disease, dirt, debt and drink were the four demons possessing them. The village has increased from eleven to twenty-five houses. These are bigger, more solidly built and more neatly thatched. Almost every family possesses cattle; a few, bullock-carts; some have acquired land. Women dress decently. Bright and happy faces testify to the joy that has come into their lives.'[2]

Many of the reports show a falling off of necessary support from home. *The Call from India* says: 'We have had to make reduction in expenditure amounting to £3,700 a year.' Whereas efficiency in the work being done seems to require an additional income of £40,000 a year.

The falling off in the European clerical staffs is shown by these figures. C.M.S. clergy in four stations in 1913—1915 were ninety-five; in 1923—1924 they were only fifty-eight. S.P.G. clergy in five stations in 1913 were fifty-four; in 1923 they were forty-one.

Is there any special cause behind this falling off in home support? Possibly it is due to some misapprehension as to what missionary aims really are. There is a fairly wide impression in the non-missionary world, due to some errors in former missionary methods, that missions aim at securing converts, whose change of faith makes little improvement in their daily walk and conversation. This certainly is not the aim of the best missionaries.

The *Call from the Moslem World* tells us what we have no difficulty in believing:

'A Mohammedan judges a religion by the nations professing it, and the failure of Christianity to leaven all western life is a real stumbling block to many.'

In *The Call from the Far East*, stress is laid upon the danger of race friction. The overcrowded populations of China and Japan look East and South to the young Anglo-Saxon nations with their great unoccupied territories and their immigration laws designed to prevent incursions of Asiatics with their lower economic standards of living. In the case of the Chinese, the situation is rendered more acute by the extra-territoriality and similar privileges of the white races on Chinese soil.[3] This, coupled with the widespread demand for self-determination—the product of an increasingly self-conscious nationalism, which

[2] I have compressed the Bishop's words.
[3] See *The Call from the Far East*, pp. 4 and 5.

seems in some quarters to be mistaken for the Spirit of Christ—has roused a temper which must prove desperately dangerous, when the 400 millions of China, the 320 millions of India, and the 60 millions of Japan rise against the lack of outlets into that vast territory held at present by tiny white populations. Some Englishmen look to the naval base at Singapore, some to a soundly organized and energetically supported British emigration policy, some to Geneva and the League of Nations, some to the extension of the Christian Church in the East, to avert the evil day. It is clear that Christian missions in the East may here prove a factor of great international importance by the creation of a better spirit on both sides.

The report on South Africa says:

> 'The racial problem has assumed proportions which make it obviously insoluble by merely human forces. The country contains nearly five times as many natives as Europeans, and the black population increases with greater rapidity than the white.'

While the white employer is seeking coloured labour for mine and farm, the white mechanic is afraid of the competition of advancing native skill. This situation has caused 'the iniquitous colour bar proposals, whereby the native is to be prevented from becoming a skilled worker, in order that all such work may be the preserve of the white man.'

The South African report prophesies that 'every large area will be predominantly black': and maintains that 'the drastic proposals of segregation are seemingly based on the conception of an essential antagonism between black and white.'

In the *Times* of February 9th, we read that a protest has been made against the principle of racial differentiation in the bill before the Union Assembly in South Africa, the first reading of which was carried by eighty-one votes to ten. The Bishop of Natal expressed in a sermon 'grave anxiety as to whether South Africa, without breaking her pledged word, could legislate as proposed.' The reports naturally and properly lay stress on the obligation of Englishmen living in contact with races of other religions to lead Christian lives.

> 'We wish to emphasise that in districts where there is a permanently settled community, unless a high Christian standard is maintained among the white population, missionary work among the natives is severely handicapped. The life of the white settler and Government official in Africa speaks loudly, and more often than the voice of the missionary' (*Call from Africa*, p. 56).

The message of these reports seems to us to be: 'If Christians wish to set the houses of other people in order, they should be careful not to neglect their own. They should not withdraw from the mission field, but realize that until they have a form of the Christian Faith and an ideal of the Christian Life, which can win educated Europeans to Christ, they will not be able to win and hold the nations of the Orient. The sooner Traditionalist Christianity can modernize itself and Christianize the lives of its own people, the better for its influence both at home and abroad.'

BOOK REVIEWS

TWO FRENCH BOOKS ON ST. THOMAS AQUINAS.*

The first of these two books draws attention to an aspect of the saint's character which has sometimes been overlooked. 'Nous ne pouvons pas douter que le saint a été un veritable mystique.'

Beneath the public life at the University and the Curia was the deep undercurrent of a mystic's life. The 'athlete of the faith' who contended against the Averroists led by the brilliant Siger of Brabant, and against the seculars of the University under Maitre Guillaume de Saint-Amour, was upheld by contemplation, by vision, by ecstasy.

The second book, besides giving a parallel French-Latin text illustrative of the chief lines of thought, also contains a suggestive introduction briefly summing up the recent contributions to Thomist studies made by Gilson, Mandonnet, Sertillanges, Garrigou-Lagrange, Pègues and other writers.

The selections, which occupy 275 pages, follow the arrangement of the original. *Prima Pars*, on the nature and limits of theology, as a science based on supernatural revelation, is here represented by the inquiry into the nature and the attributes of God.

The headings are *De L'Existence de Dieu; De La Simplicité de Dieu; De L'Eternité de Dieu.*

Secunda Pars deals with the Creation as follows: *De L'Union de L'Ame avec le Corps; De La Connaissance de L'Ame par rapport aux choses corporelles.*

The remainder is taken up by the section on Grace from the second portion of *Pars Secunda.*

Pars Tertia is not represented at all. We thus avoid the Romanist views of the Sacraments, which Aquinas upheld. It will be remembered that he defends *latria* of images, indulgences, and in general the position later taken up by the Council of Trent.

What we have here is therefore the philosophical and psychological part of his work, in which one may trace a mystical tendency.

While the first of these two French books sees in Aquinas the Mystic, M. Truc admires more his psychology. He considers that Aquinas' main

**Saint Thomas d'Aquin. La Vocation, L'Oeuvre, La Vie Spirituelle,* par L. H. Petitot, O.P. (Paris. 5 fr.)

La Pensée de St. Thomas d'Aquin. Extraits les plus caractéristiques de la Somme Théologique, choisis et groupés par Gonzague Truc, avec une introduction, une bibliographie, et le texte latin correspondant, par G. Truc. (Paris, 1925. 12 fr. 325 pp.)

debt to Aristotle was the fundamental distinction between the potential and the actual, which he combined with the Jewish-Christian idea of creation to form that doctrine of contingence and of love which is his key to creation. This combination of ideas gives life to the purely logical conception of a *primum mobile,* and confers upon the initial potentiality a perpetual actualization. Thus one can attribute to the First Cause an independence which places it utterly above those secondary causes which it nevertheless conditions. It is by such an inquiry into the possibility of a contact between the Creator and creation that we can dimly conjecture the Divine Nature and its attributes.

But, for the rest, he would hold him an Augustinian.

'Cette période est surtout d'inspiration platonicienne et Augustin reste le maître du choeur. On se complaît aux subtilités du pseudo-Denys.'

Petitot shows us the Aquinas of the Eucharistic hymns, *Lauda Sion salvatorem, Pange lingua, Ecce Panis angelorum, Tantum ergo, Verbum supernum prodiens, O Salutaris hostia, Adoro Te devote.*

Truc would show us the Aquinas whom Hooker described as 'the greatest among the Schoolmen,' on whom he based the first three books of the 'Ecclesiastical Polity,' the Aquinas whose hard outlines were shaded off by Illingworth in his books on personality and on immanence.

There is yet another point of view from which to study Aquinas, which has been marked out for us by Evelyn Underhill and Dean Inge.

These French books never refer to his mysticism save as affecting him by trances and visions. But to one who possesses the works of Dionysius the Areopagite and can compare them with the text of Aquinas here given, the influence of the former is remarkable.

The French text recalling some phrases of Bergson, a further resemblance becomes evident.

The main points of the mystical line of thought are as follows :—

'L'angélologie de St. Thomas est curieuse et déjà éclaire sa psychologie.'

'La psychologie thomiste repose sur cette grande maxime. Ce qui est reçu est dans ce qui reçoit à la manière de ce qui reçoit (ad modum recipientis).

Feeble, uncertain, subject to time, disengaging itself painfully from the potential, acquiescing in truth and reality rather than grasping them, man's intellect, illumined by the Divine Mind, makes guesses at those things which pertain to the realm of pure spirit.

Starting then from man's two-fold nature, body and spirit, Aquinas sets himself to discern the intents of the heart, and in his Treatise on the Passions writes one of the 'most astounding pages of psychology.'

The impulse of the senses is counterbalanced by the social tendency of the reasoning power. God puts into the heart of each the desire of his appointed destiny, and allows him to arrive at it by a power of movement naturally indeterminate. In the last resort the object of beatitude is defined as the possession of God to the utmost capacity. This being achieved by vision, contemplation is to be esteemed above action.

The verdict of the author is cautious. *'C'est de l'être humain qu'il conclut l'être en soi, du relatif qu'il déduit l'absolu, et il doit supprimer le temps sans quoi rien ne s'explique à lui pour trouver l'éternité.'* One is reminded of the saying of Milman on the schoolmen in Latin Christianity : 'With all their researches into the unfathomable they fathomed nothing.' Yet one would hardly endorse Colet's charge of arrogance against Aquinas for attempting to define all things.

Surely it is precisely those ideas which Aquinas shares with Dionysius which most informed his life. There is a parallel between Dionysius' account of yearning as a movement of the soul caused by the object of yearning and Aquinas' saying that the vision of truth ends in a movement of desire.

There is a parallel also between the 'very eternity' of Dionysius and the *aeternitas* of St. Thomas, while the *aevum* of St. Thomas has been compared to Bergson's *durée*. This has been described as Time accelerated to the stillness of infinite motion, and so changed into eternity, as in human souls when finally clothed with perfected immortality. Aquinas speaks of *aevum* as standing between time and eternity but participating in both. There is in each one of us a timeless self, spoken of by mystics as the 'spark.' Our perfection consists in this ultimate reality, which is each man's self, shining through his whole being and transforming it. Thus man is lifted from the plane of time to that of eternity. The movements of his soul will then be so intense that they will attain a *totum simul*. There is now in the soul an infinite motion, thus motion has been changed into rest, time into eternity.

For St. Thomas the 'spark' is the highest activity of the moral sense, a remnant of unfallen humanity.

The intellectual soul, says Aquinas, is created on the confines of eternity and time. Contemplation gives to the eternal plane and to the powers which can communicate with that plane a chance to affect man.

The next three quotations should be read in connection with the story of the passing of St. Thomas.

'The mind that sees the divine substance must be totally divorced from the bodily senses either by death or some rapture.'

'The last perfection to supervene upon a thing is its becoming the cause of other things.'

Certainly Aquinas was an example of the creativeness of the mystical type.

'Touch,' says Aquinas, 'applies to spiritual things as well as to material things. The fulness of intelligence is the obliteration of intelligence.' He speaks here of the immediacy of spiritual experience.

Petitot describes the saint's end thus.

On the 6th of December, 1273, while at Naples, when saying mass in the Chapel of St. Nicholas, Brother Thomas was ravished with an ecstasy and had a marvellous vision. He had to be recalled to consciousness. When he came out of this intense and prolonged trance, he was much changed (*mira mutatione commotus*).

Thenceforward he ceased to write or dictate. 'How can you thus abandon your great work?' asked Brother Reginald. 'I can no more,' replied the saint. 'After what I have seen, all that I have written appears as straw.'

Wishing to die in a house of religious, he was moved to Fossa Nuova. *Haec requies mea*, he said as he entered. His last efforts were spent in commenting to the brethren on the 'Song of Songs.'

The brethren traced his death to the vision at Naples. *'Bien d'autres saints sont morts d'avoir trop aimé Dieu; St. Thomas est l'un des rares mystiques le seul à notre connaissance, qui soit mort de l'avoir vu.'* (Many other saints have died from their too ardent love of God; St. Thomas is one of the rarer mystics, the only one we have known, who died from having seen Him.)

Thus the pious biographer concludes in a manner which recalls our own Isaac Walton.

Alston Vicarage, Cumberland. ARTHUR WATSON.

IMMANENCE AND INCARNATION.*

'Is Christianity the Absolute Religion, destined to supersede all others? Or is it one among many expressions of religious experience, the finest perhaps, but still only relatively good?' This is the great problem which underlies Mr. Davenport's subject—a problem of vital interest to all Christians, and especially urgent to any who are engaged in the study of Comparative Religion or in the presentation of Christianity to those of other faiths. And the solution of this problem (as Mr. Davenport clearly sees) depends upon the meaning of the Christian Doctrine of the Incarnation of God in Christ, and the relation of this to the Indwelling of God in Nature and in all good men.

In traditional Christianity the Doctrine of the Immanence of God has received comparatively little emphasis, and consequently the revival of Immanentism in modern thought has found itself somewhat out of sympathy with the Church. So Mr. Davenport first sets out to justify the place of Immanence in a Christian view of life. While he rejects some theories of Immanence (Acosmism, Pantheism, Vitalism, etc.) as inconsistent with Christianity, he claims for 'Panentheism' a rightful place in the Christian scheme (pp. 125, 140, 246). It is not always easy to gather his exact meaning; for he does not always stop to define his terms carefully, and he rarely lightens his argument by illustrations—which, even if a little inaccurate, are often illuminating, especially to the 'layman' in philosophy. But the conception of Immanence which he advocates contains the following elements:

(1) God is the 'underlying constitution' of all things:
'By Immanence we signify the maintenance of a thing or person in being; not that He is that thing or person; nor that He is completely other than it; but that He is all that it is, while it is not all that He is; it has its life, its existence, solely in and through and by His life, His existence' (p. 234, *cf.* p. 12).

(2) God's Immanence is *not* a fully *Personal* mode of indwelling:
'By His immanent Presence, He is still separated as regards His *Person* from us' (p. 136).

(3) Immanence is relative, and partial:
'Immanence admits of *degrees*' (p. 111, *cf.* p. 108).

Immanence, thus defined, is (Mr. Davenport maintains) a true part of the Christian *Weltanschauung*, and he rightly points out that, so far from being (as is not infrequently assumed) a half-way house towards Pantheism, it is really just as incompatible with thoroughgoing Pantheism as with Deism (pp. viii, 76). For if God is *identified* with 'Creation,' the term 'God' becomes superfluous, and the whole conception of God 'coming to dwell' in the world or in Man is intelligible only if God is in some sense transcendent.

But while our author thus defends the place of Immanence in Christian thought, he does not seem to feel that its position is a vital one: 'While faith forbids any denial of the Incarnate One, it has not a similar interest in the doctrine of Immanence' (p. 57 f.; *cf.* Dr. Tennant's Preface to the book, p. v).

But when Mr. Davenport turns from Immanence to Incarnation, we are conscious at once of a heightening of his fervour and of his dogmatism. He again reviews various theories, and while deprecating excessive preci-

**The Norrisian Prize Essay for 1924.* By S. F. Davenport, M.A., LL.B. (Camb. Univ. Press. 1925. 10/6.)

sion in doctrinal matters, he lays down the following as essential for Christian faith:

(1) Incarnation must be absolute:

'While Immanence admits of *degrees, Incarnation* admits of none. In the conception of Incarnation, as understood by Christian thought, we are presented with a final, supreme and *absolute* revelation of God to man' (p. 111).

'Our hearts are assured that a great gulf is fixed between the many lights of the world and the One Light . . . Between unique inspiration, to whatever degree of intensity this may extend, and Incarnation there is an unfathomable barrier which forbids all identity' (pp. xix, xx; *cf.* pp. 190, 247).

(2) Incarnation, unlike Immanence, is Personal. Dorner is quoted with approval:

'God was in Christ, in a conscious, personal mode of existence apart from the "Father"' (p. 268).

(3) Incarnation involves the pre-existence of Christ, 'in a sense that cannot be attributed to any other being, for through His agency and mediation were the worlds created' (p. 190).

(4) Incarnation 'can only take place in *One* individual *once*' (p. 112).

With these definitions of Immanence and Incarnation respectively we are not left in doubt as to the difference between them in the author's mind. The one is partial, not fully personal, and continually taking place, πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως: the latter is absolute, final, occurring once only in all history, and never to be superseded. So Mr. Davenport insists that between the two there is 'an unfathomable barrier' (p. xx; the metaphor seems a little mixed, but the meaning is clear). 'In Incarnation we have, not an instance of the maximum revelation of God through humanity, but a Person in whom a divine Person is incarnate' (p. 247).

We infer from such passages that Mr. Davenport would prefer to describe the difference between the Indwelling of God in Christ and His Indwelling in other men and things as a 'difference in kind' rather than a 'difference in degree,' and that he would not be satisfied with any theory which would liken the relation between the two Indwellings to the relation between Infinity and any finite number, or to the relation between the Perfect Ideal and its imperfect adumbrations. 'Even when the day dawns, and we dwell in God and God in us, the Divine Immanence then perfected in human nature will be distinct from that displayed in the "Only-Begotten Son"' (p. 230; quoted from F. Platt).

The book is one which students of the subject will be wise not to neglect, though the style is difficult and the repetition of ideas, and even phrases, is at times wearisome. The value of the book would be enhanced by a revision of the system of quotations from other writers. Often the difficulty of disentangling the author's own opinions from the words of his authorities presents quite a 'Johannine' problem (*e.g.* on p. 31, *where* do 'the words of the Abbot' begin and end?), and constantly the quotations are not furnished with any adequate means for their verification by reference.

With regard to the subject-matter, the book is open to two main criticisms.

In the first place, it hardly touches upon what is surely the greatest of all problems connected with the idea of Immanence: *viz.* the reconciliation of it with the Moral Dualism which confronts our conscience in this world. If God 'is the eternal ground of everything' (p. 12), what is His relation

to moral evil? If 'the whole of evolution is but the continual passage of God as Transcendant to God as Immanent' (p. 110), why has this process led to the evolution of *sin*? It may be said that these problems never have been (and perhaps never can be) fully answered with human knowledge; but at least they demand fuller recognition, as being the gravest obstacles in the way of acceptance of Immanentism . . . Here and there, indeed, we find a passing reference to this—'Love and goodness are a truer index of the character of God than the metaphysical attributes of omnipresence, omnipotence and omniscience' (p. 18; *cf.* p. 234 f); but the thought is not followed up.

The great 'Immanentist' religions of the world, Hinduism and Buddhism, while producing a deep mystical religious sense, have certainly failed to awaken in their followers that 'passion for righteousness' which have characterised the 'Transcendentalist' faiths of Jewry and Islam. Would an 'Immanentist' Christianity be free from a similar danger? It is interesting to note that Fr. Holmes, of Calcutta, whose book, *The Presence of God* (quoted by Mr. Davenport, p. 126), was written against a background of Hinduism, shows an awareness of this problem which many more famous writers have failed to display; and no study of Immanence can be satisfying which does not at least fully face the gravity of this difficulty.

The second main criticism of Mr. Davenport's thesis is this: that his exposition of the Doctrine of the Incarnation is likely to appeal only to those who share with him certain pre-suppositions. As soon as he approaches this subject he seems to lapse from argument to affirmation, or to what he himself calls 'the language of the heart' (p. 201). He maintains that 'the *fact* of Christ's *real,* and not merely ideal, pre-existence' is 'vital to the Christian faith' (p. 190), and that 'to predicate *Godhead* of Christ is implicit in Christian experience, and alone is capable of interpreting the absolute nature of that experience' (p. 196). In other words, we gather that his view is that 'Christian experience' has an 'absolute quality which requires us to attribute a similar Absoluteness to Christ, its source.

Now this 'appeal to experience' is one which has a legitimate place, and often stands in welcome contrast to the methods of the older dogmatic. But as applied here it needs further development if it is to carry general conviction. For several questions at once present themselves:—

(1) Is 'Christian experience' so unique in quality as Mr. Davenport assumes? Has not the study of Psychology and of Comparative Religion shown that the general religious experience of mankind presents many features which were formerly thought to be peculiar to the Christian Church? Have not the men of all ages regarded their own religious experience as a basis on which to build a dogmatic structure which includes the ascription of Divinity to the God from whom such grace has come?

In spite of all this, it may well be that eventually Christian experience will be found to contain just such a quality of 'absoluteness' as Mr. Davenport postulates. But at present this is widely questioned, at least among those who do not accept the absoluteness of the Incarnation in Christ. So the attempt to build a doctrine of the Incarnation upon the 'fact' of the uniqueness of Christian experience will be met by the rejoinder: 'But *that* is just the question at issue!'

(2) Mr. Davenport's appeal to Christian experience leaves us wondering whom he would recognize as the legitimate subjects of that experience. There are certainly many, to whom Christ has been the supreme experience of life, who have *not* deduced from this the doctrine of the Absoluteness of the Incarnation in Christ, as Mr. Davenport defined it. Among these

are the advocates of 'Universal Incarnation,' such as T. H. Green, or the Cairds (p. 177); or Dr. Rashdall, when he wrote: 'It is impossible to maintain that God is fully incarnate in Christ, and not incarnate at all in anyone else' (*Jesus, Human and Divine*, p. 19). Are all such to be dismissed as defective in their Christian experience? If not, the deduction of a doctrine of Absolute Incarnation from Christian experience would not appear to be universally cogent.

Indeed, one might question whether such experience, which (by reason of the frailty of our human nature) is necessarily relative and imperfect, can ever be made a secure basis for a doctrinal affirmation of absolute values.

(3) Lastly, the whole subject needs to be much more carefully related to the Historic Person of Our Lord. Mr. Davenport does indeed appeal to 'the fact of the Jesus of History' (p. 237); but he builds up his theories along the lines of *a priori* philosophic reasoning. When at length he bids us turn 'without preconceptions' to the Gospel narratives he touches but briefly on the subject, and relies mainly on texts from the Fourth Gospel (pp. 257-262).

He makes no attempt to answer the question which for many minds is of primary importance in approaching this subject: 'Is there adequate evidence, from the Synoptic narratives, studied in the light of modern knowledge, that Our Lord Himself claimed to be, or was conscious of being, the Absolute and Final Incarnation of God?' To build a doctrine on *a priori* reasoning, *plus* the Fourth Gospel, will not satisfy those who have been accustomed to historical methods of investigation; they will still ask: 'But *was* it part of the teaching of Christ Himself?' And to that question Mr. Davenport's book will give them no satisfactory answer.

We have ventured to offer some criticisms of Mr. Davenport's thesis, just because both the subject and his treatment of it have seemed to be worthy of careful consideration. His learned work makes a contribution of real value to the literature of the subject; and we trust that at no distant date he may pursue it further, and discuss some of those aspects of this great question which are exercising the minds of Christian people to-day, both in this country and overseas.

E. C. Dewick.

THE ALBIGENSES.*

The proverb that you give a dog a bad name and then hang him is true, but is not the whole truth. For the story usually has a sequel. Someone, after a decent interval, comes forward and ventures the suggestion that he was not such a bad dog after all. In time the poor quadruped even acquires a tolerable reputation. It is on this principle that virtues have been discovered in the Pharisees as to which the Gospels are silent, and elements of value found in the Gnostics which to Hippolytus and Epiphanius would have seemed wholly incredible. Catiline, we are told, did not deserve all his reputation, and Judas Iscariot may have been guilty of blindness and miscalculation but possibly was not deliberately a traitor.

It is with a kindred purpose that Mr. Edmond Holmes writes the valuable little book now before our notice. The heretical movement, misnamed Albigensian, has not been fairly treated by history; its importance has been underrated, its better aspects unrecognized. Mr. Holmes offers us fuller information and suggests to us a truer estimate. He would reinstate these misjudged sectaries in their rightful place and claim for them some measure

**The Albigensian or Catharist Heresy.* By Edmond Holmes. (Williams and Norgate. Price 5/-. Pp. 138.)

of the esteem which long years ago 'Les Bonshommes' enjoyed in Southern France. The result of his labours is a slight volume of 138 pages, which the expert will not fail to treat with respect, and the educated reader who is not an expert will read with grateful appreciation. It is a short study whose value and whose interest are certainly not to be measured by its bulk.

Mr. Holmes' estimate of the Albigensian or Catharist movement is his own, but for his facts he acknowledges his debt to Schmidt's *Histoire et Doctrine de la secte des Cathars ou Albigeois*, a book which was the work of a French Professor of Theology in Strasbourg and was published in Paris and Geneva in 1849. This is, we are told, the only book on Catharism which is both authoritative and comprehensive. It is out of print, and 'deserves to be brought up to date by a competent editor.' Here obviously is an opportunity for one of our younger historians.

Mr. Holmes' own book falls into three divisions. The first chapter gives us the doctrine, practice and general history of Catharism. The second deals with the Tragedy of Languedoc. Lastly we have a discussion of the Philosophy of Catharism. We will mention these subjects in their order.

The movement began in the tenth century in the Balkan peninsula, probably in Bulgaria; its last home was also in the same restless neighbourhood, in Bosnia. Its greatest success was in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, when it was widespread in Southern France, especially in Languedoc. It recalled in its teaching many of the earlier heresies. For Catharism was dualistic, like the Manichaeans; it rejected the Old Testament, like Marcion; it would only tolerate an apparent incarnation, after the manner of the Docetae. Catharism believed in metempsychosis and was strongly ascetic. The obvious blending of good with evil in the present order this heresy explained, not by any 'Fall' in Adam's garden, but by a visit once paid by the Devil to the good God's heaven. This, as Mr. Holmes says, was a 'desperate expedient' (p. 17), and we wonder how teaching so speculative and arbitrary could ever claim to be Christian or achieve such undoubted popularity. On the last point explanation lies in the high ideals and devoted lives of those who were full members of the Catharist community. For there were various grades; many were *auditores* only; many were *credentes*; there were only few *perfecti*, who in 1240 numbered but 4,000 in the whole of Europe. These, who had received the full initiation of the Consolamentum, were devoted in their service, rigorous in their standard of conduct, self-denying in their voluntary poverty, steadfast unto death in persecution. The success of the movement was indeed one more victory for personal character.

It is not surprising that men drew sarcastic contrasts between the religious life of these heretics and the luxury, ignorance and depravity of many of the clergy of the period. The low standard and the evident need for reform brooked no denial, and indeed Innocent III was under no delusions as to the shortcomings of the Church over which it was his office to preside. But the unity of Christendom and the security of the Church's position were paramount considerations, and with these the growing heresy, which was fast becoming the real religion of civilized and prosperous Southern France, was plainly incompatible. Hence comes the tragedy of Mr. Holmes' second chapter. First missions were sent into Languedoc for the conversion of the heretics, but their success was slight. Then measures of persecution began, banishment for heresy, confiscations and the like. Then came a Crusade, popular, for it was easier to serve against heretics in your own country than against the infidel in the remoter Holy Land, the merit and advantages being the same. Finally, the Inquisition. 'It was in the struggle against Catharism that the Inquisition, as an or-

ganized institution, came into being and assumed the form with which the student of mediaeval history is familiar' (p. 89). 'So Catholicism triumphed in Languedoc' (p. 96). And Mr. Holmes feels all the pity of it, without ceasing to write as a historian. This was the virtual end of Catharism.

In the concluding chapter we have the philosophy of Catharism considered. Its main defect lies, according to this essay, in its dualism. Herein Catharism was more logical and thorough-going than the Church. For the Church, the Roman Church of the period at any rate, was likewise incurably dualistic. Mr. Holmes, it need hardly be said, does not lay himself open to the retort that two blacks do not make a white, but he draws the fair inference that one fundamentally dualistic society has no right to criticise another for holding the same theory only in a more absolute form. The Latin philosophy in Mr. Holmes' eyes is just as inherently erroneous as the philosophy of Languedoc. 'Was the philosophy of Catharism more unsound than that of the Catholic Church?' Had the writer of this essay given us a definite answer to his own question in a few words, possibly he would have said 'Considerably less so.'

This last chapter is of interest in a wider connection. For we have hints of a faith, monistic certainly, optimistic probably, in which Mr. Holmes himself seems to have found a provisional rest. This is the undeveloped antithesis to that Dualism which, alike in its Catharist and in its Catholic forms, is so repellent to him. India knows something of this creed (p. 105). And we are encouraged to hope that the religious thought of the future will move in this direction (pp. 135-6). We should like to hear more from Mr. Holmes on this subject. For, however reluctant we may be to accept an ultimate dualism, Marcion and his followers have had something to say for themselves, and after many gallant attempts the problem of evil is still unsolved. Moreover, in its less extreme phases dualistic theory seems almost to drop into the domain of necessary or convenient distinction, and the man who says black is not white might be said *pro tanto* to be a dualist. Professor Gwatkin was probably right in criticising the Roman Church for its 'false dualism between God and man.' Still, we must understand the distinction between God and man before we can understand their true relation. A synthesis which has not been preceded by an antithesis does not really afford us much mental satisfaction. Ideally it is no doubt true that 'no one day is more sacred in the sight of God than other days' (p. 119). Some of the Christian fathers knew this quite as well as the Catharists. And yet Sunday is an admirable institution and might even, if we understand our terms, claim a certain divine sanction.

Mr. Holmes is severe in his condemnation of the treatment which the Roman Church meted out to the unhappy Catharists. The tale of persecution is indeed a cruel and revolting one, while the subsequent distortion of history does little credit to the ecclesiastical writers whose verdict has since been so vigorously challenged. The one thing on the other side of the account is that Mr. Holmes writes from to-day's point of view. By all the standards which fair-minded and humane persons would now acknowledge, the action of Rome in Languedoc is beyond defence. But things were estimated differently in the earlier centuries. After reading what has been described as 'one of the blackest pages in the history of mankind' we can only marvel on being told that 'the age did not disapprove of these violences and persecutions' (J. F. Michaud, *History of the Crusades*, Eng. Tr., Vol. II, p. 200, notes). Of the opinions of these Catharist heretics, for whom with good reason Mr. Holmes finds so much to say, Bishop Creighton wrote :—

'Looked at from the point of view of our own day, they seem a strange mixture of good and evil; but from the point of view of the Middle Ages they were a spectacle which could only be regarded with horror. They destroyed the unity of religious belief and practice; and without the visible unity of the Church, Christianity became in men's eyes a mockery' (*History of the Papacy,* ed. 1899, Vol. I, p. 22).

To-day we shall all agree with Mr. Holmes. We shall thank him for the great interest of his short book and also approve its verdict. But who of us will assert with confidence that he would have held the same opinion had he lived in the days when Innocent the Third was Pope?

R.B.T.

THE SPIRITUAL GOSPEL.*

The Gospel according to St. John, the 'spiritual Gospel' as Clement of Alexandria called it, possesses a peculiar fascination for Christian faith and scholarship. This is due partly to its character so aptly described by Clement, and partly to the importance for Christian theology of the problems raised by any modern study of it. The Fourth Gospel rather than the Synoptics is the foundation of the Nicene and Chalcedonian Christology, and there can be no adequate common ground for the discussion of modern Christology unless some agreement is first reached about the nature of this Gospel and the use to be made of it. Among scholars who are conservative in their criticism of the Synoptic Gospels, it is possible to find in regard to the Fourth differences of opinion ranging from that which regards it as the work of John the Apostle and son of Zebedee, who writes of actual events upon which he has meditated for half a century, to that which regards it, not as history, but as 'an inspired interpretation of the person and work of Christ addressed to the third generation of Christians,' written, not by one of the Twelve, but by some later and possibly unknown disciple. It is a matter for surprise that, despite the great changes of opinion which the last fifty years have witnessed, no one has produced in English an exhaustive and first-rate commentary on *St. John* since Bishop Westcott. It is sometimes whispered that no scholar with a reputation for orthodoxy to lose would care to undertake the task.

There are, however, many books dealing with certain problems of the Johannine Gospel—its authorship, historicity, and theology. Of such are the present four volumes, two of which are by ecclesiastics and two by laymen who are not professional theologians. Dr. C. F. Nolloth, whose services to theological study have not been limited to his literary activity, has produced a book which is a thorough-going defence of the traditional view of the authorship and historical value of the Fourth Gospel. He holds that the problems cannot be and ought not to be approached without bias, though we must guard against mere predilection. Many will feel that more might be expected of human frailty in making a stand against predilectional weakness than Dr. Nolloth's book reveals. He makes the most of the familiar evidence showing the correct Palestinian colouring of the Gospel; he claims that the Evangelist portrays 'the life of Palestine at the precise time with which his story deals, and with no other,' but he gives no indication that there is anything to be said on the other side. The

**The Fourth Evangelist.* By the Rev. C. F. Nolloth, M.A., D.Litt., Hon. Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. (London: John Murray. 1925. Price 10/6. Pp. 266.)

The Message of the Fourth Gospel. By the Rev. L. A. Muirhead, D.D. (Williams and Norgate. 1925. Price 6/-. Pp. 234.)

According to St. John. By Lord Charnwood. (Hodder and Stroughton, Ltd. Price 10/-. Pp. 275.)

The Fourth Gospel. By P. V. Smith, M.A., LL.D. (London: S.P.C.K. 1926. Price 3/6. Pp. 146.)

author was certainly acquainted with the kind of argument characteristic of the Rabbis. But in *Acts* iv, 13 John is one of the Apostles who are perceived to be, though inspired, yet destitute of that type of learning (ἀγράμματοι). Is it likely that the son of Zebedee, with his ever-growing Christian experience, turned back to the study of Rabbinism? Again, Dr. Nolloth states that with the exception of the Alogi 'the whole Church in every quarter down to the death of Origen regarded the Johannine writings as the work of the younger son of Zebedee, the Apostle John.' He is aware that the earliest ascription of the Gospel to a John dates from the last quarter of the second century, some seventy years later than the date of the Gospel, and then proceeds to the curious reasoning that the agreement in assigning it to a primitive Apostle 'is the more remarkable from the fact that it was not immediately arrived at; people who had not been in contact with the author hesitated.' But it is in fact not at all clear, even when the Gospel is assigned to John, that he is called an Apostle. The argument that because the title 'apostle' had been used of missionaries generally, that of 'disciple' would have more naturally indicated one of the original Twelve, amounts to very little indeed when used of a time as late as Irenaeus. It must be obvious to anyone who has read Irenaeus that he normally uses 'Apostles' as the designation of the fountain-head from whom the true traditions had been handed down in succession.[1] It has frequently been pointed out, among others by Dr. Burney, to whom Dr. Nolloth often refers, that while Irenaeus calls not only Paul, but also Peter and Matthew Apostles, and correctly describes the other Synoptic authors, he does not directly refer to 'John the Apostle.' Supposing that for Irenaeus himself—and it *is* a supposition—John could mean no other than the Apostle, would all his readers have been so familiar with the Church history of eighty years earlier as not to need in John's case the information given in the case of others? Elsewhere in this section of Dr. Nolloth's book we have found it difficult to follow the argument. We are reminded that we possess but little of the ecclesiastical literature of the second century, and that much of what has perished 'may have contained specific allusions to the author' of the Fourth Gospel. We cannot build on inferences of this kind, and the statement is followed immediately by another confessing that the Gospel 'presenting features so unlike those that had already established themselves in the confidence of the Church did not at once gain an equal position of authority.' Why not, if it were known to be the work of an eye-witness, an original Apostle, one very intimate with Jesus, and so well known 'in Ephesus and the neighbouring Churches' as to make mention of his name unnecessary when his words were quoted? We engage in Dr. Nolloth's company on a rather pedestrian journey, but often when we come to the hill Difficulty we either do not look at it or else we circumambiate it; certainly we do not successfully climb it.

This book devotes chapters to the Philosophy and the Theology of *St. John*, and it would not be fair to complain of incompleteness in the treatment of these wide themes; but we are surprised to find no examination of the Johannine theology of the Holy Spirit. Again, in his treatment of the relation of the Synoptics and *St. John*, with a view to maintaining the historicity of the latter, we cannot feel that Dr. Nolloth has succeeded where so many have failed. He states roundly that 'it is generally allowed' that the Fourth Gospel gives correctly the dates of the Last Supper and the Crucifixion. The problem is dismissed in a page, and an unsuspecting reader would reasonably infer that there is no more to be said. Similarly, for Dr. Nolloth there is no necessary inconsistency be-

[1] *Adv. Haer.* III.ii.1–iv.1; IV.xxvi.2–5; IV.xxxii.1–xxxii.8.

tween the gradual recognition of the Messiahship of Jesus in the Synoptics and the open confession of this, and of the Divine Sonship, which appear in *St. John* from the outset. He holds that the Lukan Zachariah, Simeon, and Anna witness to the presence of Messianic expectation which might well at any time have ripened into a confession such as the Baptist's in *St. John*. The real problem Dr. Nolloth does not discuss, which is that His Messianic claim is in the Fourth Gospel made by Jesus Himself over and over again; it is very largely the theme of the discourses, and the Jews are condemned for not believing it. In the Synoptics it is equally clear that Jesus desired to conceal His Messiahship. Demoniacs, sick folk, and disciples are alike strictly charged not to publish it. In fact, we have in this matter as clear a contradiction as it is possible to find. No doubt the 'either . . . or' dilemma has often been overdone, or even invented where it does not exist; but if we are to refuse to face it when it manifestly does exist all critical historical enquiry seems to be useless, and we had better betake ourselves frankly to the task of apologetic on behalf of whatever tradition has asserted. It is hardly too much to say that if Jesus taught openly in the way *St. John* records, teaching which again and again led to serious controversy, but sometimes to its acceptance, we cannot understand why anyone should ever have produced such documents as the Synoptic Gospels. Why does the early Church in Jerusalem, as we see it in the early chapters of *Acts*, in the very city which is claimed as the scene of the stupendous utterances of the Johannine Christ, appear to be in ignorance of them, and to hold a Christology like that of *Mark*?[2] *Mark*, 'Q,' the peculiar matter in *Luke* and that in *Matthew*, all these collections of sayings and events seem to have been made and published before and in preference to those in *John*. In other words, the most explicit and stupendous claims of Jesus are withheld from the Church generally for three-quarters of a century after they were publicly uttered, and after the Resurrection would have appeared to guarantee their truth!

A valuable aspect of Dr. Nolloth's book is that it contains many references to a very wide field of relevant literature. Moreover it is to the author's credit that he makes no claim to have harmonized all incompatibilities. He believes it to be better to note them 'and to leave the task of reconciliation to the future.' 'If the evidence at our disposal fails to produce a fixed judgment and we have to resign ourselves to a position of indecision, we can hardly help cherishing a working faith in one or other aspect of the question.' Exactly. But in a verdict of 'Not Proven' when profound consequences would attend a positive decision, the importance of the verdict lies in the negative.

Dr. Muirhead's book is an addition to the Crown Theological Library. 'It is written for the unlearned, who while deeply aware of the unique worth of the Gospel of John are yet conscious of mental unrest,' but this limitation testifies rather to the author's modesty than to the real usefulness of his book. Its twenty-six chapters were originally sermons preached to the author's congregations at East Wemyss and Broughty Ferry. Dr. Muirhead does not consider the problem of the authorship of St. John's Gospel of fundamental importance. The author, whoever he was, aimed at reflecting the *mind* and the '"spiritual"' things of Jesus.' Consequently 'we are in this Gospel in a region of subjectivity which is clearly marked off from the atmosphere of the three earlier Gospels.' The contact with historic reality can be kept by seeking Synoptic equivalents for Johannine scenes, while we seek for the reasons which have led John to transform them. While he has 'put into the mouth of the chief Personage an apt

[2]See *The Bible and Christian Life*, by W. Lock, D.D., p. 98.

expression of the principles he hears the followers of that Personage advocating in his own day,' the discourses 'are not in any serious sense misleading.' At the same time 'the wealth of instruction and suggestion the Church has found in the Johannine portrait of Jesus has been to some extent at the cost of reality,' but it is 'highly reasonable, though it may not be imperative,' to suppose that John had access to sources of information to which the Synoptic authors had not. In our opinion, the upshot of this mass of qualification is that we do not know where we are. Given meaning, it clearly implies that we can make no positive statement about the historicity of the Gospel as a whole which will necessarily be true of any part of it. Dr. Muirhead's Philonic studies have convinced him that such narratives in the Fourth Gospel as those of the woman of Samaria, the impotent man at Bethesda, the raising of Lazarus, and others, are allegories of a Philonic type, though the best in Philo he regards as prosaic in comparison with the Fourth Gospel, which is original and unique.

The exposition of the message of the Gospel proceeds on the basis outlined above. At the end of each chapter there are brief but admirable notes of instructive comment. In the ministry of preaching to largely non-theological congregations it is, as only those who have tried it know, often difficult to adopt the modern critical position in regard to the Fourth Gospel, and to use its inferences in a way at once helpful and honest. There is a tendency to substitute for purposes of edification another set of principles than those employed in critical study, or else to evade the difficulty by leaving the Gospel altogether alone. As always when difficulty is avoided, there is loss. Dr. Muirhead's book is an attempt to face the difficulty, and judged by that standard it is most useful and suggestive. We therefore commend it to those whose privilege and difficult duty it is to attempt what Dr. Muirhead has accomplished.

The other two books which we have for review are by laymen of eminence and distinction in other spheres than that of theology. They are not the first English laymen to write on the Fourth Gospel; an earlier work of distinction is Dr. Percy Gardner's *The Ephesian Gospel.* It is significant and characteristic of the Church of England that she possesses the allegiance of laymen both able and willing to undertake the study necessary to the production of such books as these by Lord Charnwood and Chancellor P. V. Smith—books which are likely to have a greater influence on laymen than works by ecclesiastical theologians which may exhibit greater knowledge of the specialist kind. Both these books are clearly and ably written.

Lord Charnwood adopts the grand style, enlivened by occasional sarcasm of a not unpleasant kind. Discussing the advantages of the treatment of theology by a layman, he says: 'On some much debated questions he will welcome the right answer, that we do not know. He can dismiss erudite speculations of the futile kind more boldly than theologians are permitted to do by the courtesy now common among them.'

He is perhaps a trifle unnecessarily and not quite justifiably contemptuous of certain arguments of Drs. Charles, Burney and Wellhausen. These arguments, he says, amount to nothing. Admittedly the evidence on which they are based is slight, but where all the available evidence is slight, the most is naturally and necessarily made of scanty material on both sides of a question. And some of the arguments so severely trounced are subsidiary in the contexts from which they have been cited. Incidentally, some of them happen to be referred to by Chancellor Smith, and we think he forms a truer estimate of them.

Lord Charnwood does not reach a decision about the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. In spite of what can be said against it, he regards the

Church tradition as weighty. The beloved disciple in the Gospel we are to understand to be either the actual writer or the eye-witness on whose authority the Gospel was written. The Gospel intends us to regard him as the Apostle John. Lord Charnwood inclines to the belief of Dr. Stanton that the Gospel was actually written by a follower and pupil of that Apostle. He believes, somewhat curiously, that the first Epistle is not by the same hand, but that it is the work of St. John himself. The reasons given are these. The Gospel is constructed with conscious artistry; the Epistle does not lend itself to analytical criticism. It is artless, though not in a depreciatory sense. The Gospel is ambiguous as to whether its author was an eye-witness or not: in the Epistle it is clear that he was. It is difficult to ascribe the Gospel to a man of simple rather than of learned mind, or who had lived as an Apostle is likely to have lived: the Epistle very naturally allows of such ascription. 'No other book I have seen recalls so vividly as does the Epistle characteristics which many of us have witnessed in a noble old age.'

This position is faced with the enormous difficulty afforded by any comparative analysis of content and language of the Gospel and Epistle. Few will feel it is sufficiently accounted for by a conjecture. It is suggested that the Apostle would probably have employed a secretary or translator when he wished to address Greek-speaking people, and that this secretary to whom St. John dictated the Epistle was probably the same as the author of the Gospel, who, in writing the Gospel, preserved not only the type of teaching but also the manner of speech in which he had been steeped while performing the literary service for the Apostle.

The historical value of the Gospel Lord Charnwood regards as considerable, though we have not found it easy to determine its precise extent. He very fairly introduces the usual qualifications tending against literal historicity, side by side with considerations tending to show the author's interest in history. Lord Charnwood recognises that certain of the qualifications are exceedingly difficult to allow for with any accuracy, for his general conclusion seems to be that where the Fourth deliberately corrects the Synoptic Gospels it is probably nearer than they are to historical truth. For the rest, the importance of the Gospel is that it correctly estimates the significance of the life of Jesus as this is depicted, but with greater historical accuracy, in the Synoptic Gospels. The chapter (ix) which deals most fully with this subject reveals real beauty of thought which does not fail of expression. However, where the Fourth Gospel is plainly inconsistent with rather than corrective of the Synoptics in its presentation of Jesus, Lord Charnwood does not evade the necessary conclusion in its bearing on the historicity of the later Gospel. Thus, the reticence of Jesus in the Synoptics about His Messiahship must stand as history. The disciples would not have invented it afterwards, and there are good reasons for it in the actual circumstances of the life of Jesus. In this, at least, the Fourth Gospel cannot be treated as a historical authority. Lord Charnwood admits that such defects are defects, wherefore we find some difficulty in a statement that 'they will raise no doubt of the historical truth of what is most important in the book.' The only conclusion possible, as it appears to us, is that the historical truth of any saying or of any event in the Fourth Gospel must be decided on the merits of the case in each individual instance. This it is not Lord Charnwood's purpose to do: he wishes to stimulate his readers to do it.

Lord Charnwood writes chapters on the Jewish background and Gentile environment of early Christianity, on pagan influences on Christian doctrine, and on the development of belief in the Apostolic Age. His con-

fidence in assertion seems to us to increase with the number of his pages, and not always, we feel, with a correspondingly increasing basis of fact and of reasoning to justify it. The reasoning is sometimes a little odd. We are told that the essence of Christianity was and is 'a reverence, a love, a hope, a spirit animating all conduct'; that its essence lies not in doctrinal formulas. This is true; but why the recognition of it should make us less inclined to look for the operation of foreign influences in early Christian doctrine we cannot imagine.

But whatever criticisms we should wish to make on certain positions maintained or defended by Lord Charnwood, he has worked in a truly Modernist spirit. Of the ultimate questions which lie behind literary and historical criticism he writes: 'No wise man thinks any longer that he can offer an intellectual and systematic solution of the problem, complete, certain and clear. It is wise in the first place to keep to the uttermost a fresh and open mind—open, not in the sense that it will not learn what it can learn, but that it is ready to learn more.' The last chapter, from which that extract is taken, contains some characteristically English reflections on life and religion, revealing much that is best in the English attitude to both. This is a book to read, but not by anyone who has not previously read some other books on the subjects with which it deals, or who intends to read no other.

The main subject of the book by Chancellor P. V. Smith is the historical importance of the Fourth Gospel. A kindly preface is contributed by the veteran but still active Canon J. M. Wilson, who, after long years of service to the Church, not least in the cause of Liberal theology, has recently resigned his Canonry at Worcester. He has formed a high opinion of this book, reminding us that the author, by reason of his profession, is trained and qualified to judge of evidence.

From the evidence supplied by the Gospel, Chancellor Smith finds strong reasons for identifying the author with John the younger son of Zebedee; but he finds stronger reasons against making the identification. The author's character, as it appears in the Gospel and Epistle, is not that of John as he appears in the Synoptics. The son of Zebedee was not likely to have been known to the High Priest or to have had a house in Jerusalem. The oblique way in which the author refers to himself is at least curious. On the whole Dr. Smith inclines to identify the author with one of the 'two other of His disciples' rather than with one of 'the sons of Zebedee' (*John* xxi, 2). He agrees with Eusebius in accepting the statement of Papias that in the second century there was in Asia a presbyter John, whose traditions about Jesus were regarded as of equal weight with Apostolic testimony; he was not an Apostle. After dealing briefly with the relative evidence supplied by Polycrates, and drawing on the arguments from Dr. Burney's *Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, Dr. Smith concludes that the probability favours the view that the author of the Gospel was a Judaean of priestly family, who was nevertheless contemporary with the scenes which he narrates and present at some of them. Either this, or he is romancing. Neither Chancellor Smith nor Lord Charnwood seriously considers the possibility, so obvious to Dr. Muirhead, that the author of the Gospel made use of allegory to convey spiritual truth. They do not weigh the possibility that he may have been well-nigh indifferent to historical truth as we understand it.

The bulk of this book is comprised in a single chapter, devoted to an examination *seriatim* of the distinctive contents of the Fourth Gospel and a comparison of it with the Synoptists. We regret that we cannot regard the work as impartial. Chancellor Smith accepts, on the self-testimony of

the Gospel, that the author was an eye-witness. As it appears to us, that decision can reasonably be reached only after a comparison of the narrative with what we otherwise know of Jesus. But the decision seems to us frequently to be used to support the Fourth Gospel where it conflicts with the Synoptics. Chancellor Smith says that it is 'quite a mistake' to suppose that the Synoptics represent our Lord as claiming Messiahship for the first time when He sanctioned Peter's confession of it at Caesarea Philippi. This is supposed to be proved by the story of Jesus's visit to Jerusalem at the age of twelve; by the fact that the title 'Son of God' appears in the first verse of *Mark* (where it is possibly an interpolation); and by the demonic confessions. Can anyone regard this as serious evidence that Jesus *claimed* Messiahship earlier than at Caesarea Philippi? And what of this? Dr. Smith holds that Jesus undoubtedly made repeated and outspoken assertions of Messiahship as *John* records, because in Jerusalem His claim was rejected and so would not lead there to any untimely results. It was on a charge of blasphemy implied in that very claim that Jesus was condemned in Jerusalem!

As for the Johannine account of the Feeding of the Five Thousand, we read that the peculiar and personal touches are those of an eye witness whom, on this occasion, as on that of the discourse by Jacob's well, we must assume to have travelled with Jesus, which he did not always do. The vast differences in tone and content between the Johannine discourses and Synoptic teaching are explained on the familiar ground that differences of scene and differences of teaching correspond. This convenient hypothesis is utterly invalidated by the fact that one of the longest and most characteristic of Johannine discourses, that on the Bread of Life, is represented by *John* as spoken *not* in Judaea, but in Galilee. A further and similar assumption is demanded of us if we are asked to suppose that typically Johannine speech was suitable for the Samaritan woman, but not for the Galilean multitudes.

However, in spite of some almost grotesque attempts at harmonization, there is much in Chancellor Smith's examination of the contents of the Fourth Gospel which is interesting and stimulating; but we are unable to agree that this particular book has done much to maintain its claim that the Fourth Gospel is of 'supreme historical value' as a substantially accurate account of doings and sayings of our Lord while on earth.

J. S. Bezzant.

'HE MADE THE STARS ALSO.'*

It is a good thing for religious teachers to try to think cosmically: certainly those who do so will not be disposed to lapse into the aridities of ecclesiastical minutiae. Of all the sciences, astronomy is of the greatest assistance towards the development of habits of cosmical thought.

Mr. C. F. Russell, late Hulsean Lecturer, and a leading Modernist theologian, has done not only a service to popular science, but also to theology, by translating *Astronomy To-day*, by the Abbé Moreau, Director of the Observatory of Bourges. The Abbé has a lucid and popular style, and though less imaginative and poetical than that other French writer of books on popular astronomy, M. Camille Flammarion, we find him more interesting. Professor Huxley affirmed that the miracles of the theologians are the merest child's play compared with the marvels of the scientists. Possibly the comparison is odious, but certainly the marvels of science are in many cases much less easily imaginable than the miracles of the Bible.

**Astronomy To-day.* By the Abbé Th. Moreau, translated by C. F. Russell, M.A. (Methuen, 1926. Price, 10/6 net.)

To be informed that this earth is moving in a gaping void at a speed fifteen times as great as the muzzle velocity of a projectile fired from our biggest guns would be incredible if it were not demonstrable. Whilst it would be absurd to say that astronomy is in its infancy, seeing that the Babylonians calculated eclipses some 700 B.C., yet it is quite clear that immense fields of astronomical research are opening up in a universe which, from the astronomical point of view, is growing larger every day.

M. Moreau's book, as its title suggests, is up to date. It contains a brief account of the significance of Einstein's theory, but it is pointed out that an attitude of suspense ought to be adopted in regard to it. Although it seems certain that Newton's law and Kepler's laws are only approximate, yet experimental results have not accorded accurately with the demands of Einstein's theory of relativity.

The Abbé writes as a loyal Romanist, and resents the statement that Halley's comet in 1456 led Pope Calixtus III to authorise prayers in which it was exorcised. The Abbé, although he makes no reference to the persecution of Galileo by the Inquisition, yet indicates the fallibility of scientists by pointing out that Galileo rejected contemptuously Kepler's explanation of the tides which has since been accepted as valid by astronomers.

The Abbé does not find that astronomical conclusions conflict with belief in a Creator. The last sentence of his book runs as follows :—

> 'Thus, behind the transparent veil of phenomena, there stands revealed the part played by Creative Thought, always youthful, always present, always at work, presiding over the birth of the atom, even as it directs the evolution of the farthest star lost in the unplumbed immensity of space.'

The volume is well-printed and contains sixty-two illustrations and a good index. We hope that the second edition will contain a Translator's Preface. H.D.A.M.

THE HEALING GODS OF ANCIENT CIVILIZATIONS.*

The author of the book bearing this title, Walter Addison Jayne, is a physician, Emeritus Professor of Gynecology and Abdominal Surgery in the University of Colorado. The book is published by the Yale University Press in America and by Humphrey Milford in England. Dr. Jayne's interest in writing it has been in what may be described as the history of pre-historic medicine. His material has been drawn from standard works dealing with the magic, mythologies and religions of the ancient Egyptians, Babylonians, Semites of the West, Iranians, Indians, Romans, Greeks and of the ancient Celts. Only the pre-Christian era is dealt with, and no attempt is made to appraise the relative values of divine, mental and material healing practices. The very full Bibliography which is appended to the book is in itself of considerable value.

We do not know of any other single book which has gathered together so much interesting and valuable material on the subject. It must have been no easy task to sift his sources as skilfully as Dr. Jayne has sifted them. Much, of course, of what is said about ancient Greece and Rome will be more or less familiar to classical students and scholars; but it is an advantage to have it set down in correlation with what is said about other ancient or more ancient countries. Of quite special interest and value are the chapters on the healing gods of ancient Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, India and Iran. Here Dr. Jayne avails himself of publications which are not well known to ordinary students. More might perhaps have

**The Healing Gods of Ancient Civilization.* By Professor W. A. Jayne. (Oxford University Press. 1925. Price 23/- net.)

been said with advantage about ancient India, but the book already runs to 569 pages.

The book has a special significance just now, when so much attention is being given to various methods of healing. It shows how ancient, in appearance at least, are some of our modern panaceas. We learn, for instance, that even the virtues of cabbage and cabbage water were not unknown in ancient times. Among the ancient Romans, Cato the Elder put much faith in cabbage, using it with water for fistulas, with honey for sores, and as a poultice for dislocated bones. Whether Suggestion and Auto-suggestion were practised consciously and deliberately may be doubted. That they were practised widely in an unconscious, or in a subconscious, way admits of no doubt. Indeed the use, as by a kind of inspiration, of Suggestion and Auto-suggestion in ancient or primitive magic and religion emerges as one of the outstanding factors in the promotion of civilisation. We are beginning now consciously to take control of a power which has been exercised unconsciously or subconsciously since the dawn of history and to some extent even in pre-historic times.

Dr. Jayne's work is concerned, as we have said, with the pre-Christian era. His book does not deal with Judaism, Christianity or Islam. Nevertheless it has a bearing on the practice of healing in these religions, and provides us with food for thought. It is remarkable that in these faiths acts of healing are not particularly characteristic of the work of their founders. Physical healing does not seem to have been a distinctive feature of their message. It became really prominent only in the later development of their teaching. And yet, especially in the case of Christianity, the idea of an intensification of life is particularly pronounced. It is indeed quite characteristic of Christianity that it promises new life. Why then is so little stress laid on a new life of the body? The reason seems to be that life was understood or reinterpreted in a spiritual sense. The remarkable thing, indeed, about the religion of Jesus is this purely-spiritual interpretation of old ideas and of what are usually described as old 'symbols.' Water was known of old as a thing which possessed magical life-stuff. To Jesus it became a pure symbol for newness of life. Gods and heroes were known of old as saviours and life-givers. Aramaic usage suggests that Jesus also was known as the life-giver. He seems to have used such language as to give rise to the title 'Life-giver.' In early Syriac literature, including the Syriac New Testament, he is spoken of frequently as Life-giver, where Greek uses the expression Saviour. This, according to Burkitt, was the original designation. After the time of Jesus this designation was taken to mean giver of life to the body quite as much as giver of life to the soul. But in his own use of the expression or of language which gave rise to the expression, he seems to have meant primarily and essentially 'giver of life' in the sense of 'giver of a new and spiritual life.' Christianity, as taught by Jesus, meant a newness of outlook, a change of consciousness. Such a change of consciousness would often carry with it a change in the physical body; but this seems to have been a secondary consideration. It might be one of the signs that followed a change of mentality. But if a man had a humped back he could gain new life, in a Christian sense, without waiting for his back to straighten.

It is a mistake to identify faith-healing with Christianity. If Christianity had been little more than a faith-healing religion, it could hardly have proved itself superior to other religions. Faith-healing is not necessarily religious at all. A person may be healed mentally, and even physically, by faith in Agnosticism. And a limit to the healing power of the mind exercised on the lines of ordinary Suggestion or Auto-suggestion

can hardly be fixed. The practice of mental healing or of faith-healing was never an essential part of higher religion. It is becoming a science quite independent of religion. Whatever, therefore, may be the present position of Christianity, or whatever the future may have in store, it is futile to attempt to give it new life by pretending that it is a kind of quack medicine for all ills, physical as well as mental. This is surely not the real meaning of Christianity. The new life which it promises is a new apprehension, or a true apprehension of spiritual realities. When this is achieved, the rest may follow incidentally. MAURICE A. CANNEY.

THE DAILY WALK.*

This is a Book of Devotions, consisting of a passage of Scripture, one or more collects, and a hymn for every day in the year. It has been carefully compiled from various sources ancient and modern; in each case there is a connection between the prayers, the hymn and the reading. Dedicated to the compiler's children and personal friends, 'the underlying thought in the first instance was to help those who had been united in holy matrimony to walk together in the narrow way.' No purpose, in these days, could be more timely or more called for. But its scope was subsequently widened; and it is hoped that it may be found useful to a larger public, 'more especially to the young.' Such compilations, of which this it the most recent, are convenient in our hurried modern life: of the Bible, in particular, Lady Wimborne says truly that 'frequently people do not read it, because they do not know what to read.' The selections are short and to the point; the book is attractive; and should be appreciated by those for whom it is intended. If this is so, the compiler's object will have been attained.

A. F.

PAPERS IN MODERN CHURCHMANSHIP.

We desire to draw the particular attention of our readers to the excellent series of Modernist Tracts** edited by the Rev. C. F. Russell, Headmaster of King Edward's School, Southampton, and late Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge. Their titles and authors are as follows: (i) *Liberalism in Religion* by the Dean of St. Paul's; (ii) *The Nature of Punishment and Forgiveness* by Dr. Douglas White; (iii) *What is the Church?* by Dean Hastings Rashdall; (iv) *Criticism and the Old Testament* by Professor Kennett; (v) *The Problem of Suffering* by Canon Glazebrook; (vi) *Inspiration* by Canon Bindley; (vii) *Religion and Science* by Rev. J. C. Hardwick; (viii) *The Virgin Birth of Christ* by Rev. T. F. Royds; (ix) *The Atonement* by Dr. Douglas White; (x) *The Stories of Genesis* by Professor Kennett.

These papers are well and clearly printed: their style is lucid and simple: their arguments are carefully expressed: each paper consists of 16 pages: their cost is 3*d.* each. They ought to command a ready sale on Church bookstalls. May we venture to urge our parochial and cathedral clergy to make them known to their congregations? If these papers sell well the series can be greatly extended. If they do not sell well, no more can be published. We venture to hope that our readers will make a special effort to give Mr. Russell's venture of faith the support it deserves, and thereby assist in that educational work which is one of the chief functions of the Churchmen's Union. We ought to add that the papers are on sale at The Churchmen's Union Office, Church House, Westminster, S.W. 1.

H.D.A.M.

* *The Daily Walk.* Compiled by Cornelia, Lady Wimborne. (Oxford University Press, 1925). Price 7/6 net.

** Published by Longman, Green and Co.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE LATE CANON GLAZEBROOK.

To the Editor of the *Modern Churchman.*

Sir,

You will, doubtless, be inserting a notice of our late Chairman, Canon Glazebrook, in the ensuing number of the *Modern Churchman*, which will deal with his characteristics as a leading preacher, teacher, and scholar, as well as Chairman of the Council of the Churchmen's Union. May I be allowed to write some few reminiscences of him as a comrade, playmate, and 'Canonical Uncle' to me and my six little nieces at Ely, between 1906 and 1911, when we lived practically next door to him, and were privileged to enjoy intimate and loving intercourse with one who to so many appeared as stern and unapproachable. I feel that many members of the C.U. would now be glad to know of the softer traits of a noble character.

Canon Glazebrook arrived in Ely in April, 1906, at Junior Canon, my father, Archdeacon Emery, being Senior Canon of Ely at that time. Our friendship began on the very first day, when he and Mrs. Glazebrook came to tea with us after Evensong. Very soon, intellectual sympathy and literary interests in common drew us together, and formed the basis of a true and lasting friendship. Three of my little nieces were then living with us, and the childless Canon, whose heart ever yearned for children's love, and who had to pass our garden to reach his own tennis-court and kitchen garden, soon began to make shy advances to the little girls, and they to take a timid, but friendly, interest in the big new neighbour. At last the ice was broken by the second child, who, in the absence of her sisters, ventured to kiss him, because, as she told us afterwards 'He looked so lonely.' From that moment he was accepted as the dearest and best beloved of playfellows. When the Canon was seen strolling down to his garden swinging his stick, that was the signal for a rush, with a cry, 'There's Canon, he wants us.' Then in his garden or ours stories would be demanded, or offered. Some such tales, in later years, were written to his young friends while he was travelling on the continent, and were worthy to be compared with the tales 'Alice in Wonderland,' etc., told by Lewis Carrell to Alice Liddell and to Mrs. Glazebrook herself in her youth at Oxford. Auntie was not privileged to hear the stories, but I have a vivid remembrance of coming upon the Canon one day lying full length on the lawn surrounded by the children, and declaiming to them the tragic tale of Pyramus and Thisbe from the Midsummer Night's Dream, with appropriate action.

In colder weather, he would stroll up to their school-room after tea, and sit on the old settee with one child on his knees and the others clustered round him. The half-hour before lunch on Sunday was often spent with the children; and one particular Sunday in the summer of 1906, or 1907, when the fourth little girl had come to Ely and was very shy, the Canon wooed her friendship by going down on hands and knees on the tennis-court, and inviting her to take a ride on his broad back. That episode effectually won the little maid's devotion, and no such steps were ever necessary with numbers five and six, the last being privileged to call Canon and Mrs. Glazebrook her god-parents.

The welcome playfellow developed into a tender and kindly friend as the children grew older, and none will miss him more than they, though

the constant intercourse of the early days came to an end when my father died, and we left the College in February, 1911.

Another phase of Canon Glazebrook's life at Ely reveals a different, but equally unsuspected, side of his character. In 1911, the Ely Board of Guardians in the interests of economy decided not to appoint a new paid Chaplain to the Workhouse. This distressed Mrs. Glazebrook, who represented the 'parish of the College' on the Board, and to relieve the situation the Canon at once offered himself as unpaid Chaplain for a time, although he had never had any work of this kind before. Indeed, I think, he was rather glad to get into intimate touch with the poor and needy, the old and the infirm, and so learn how to apply the Christian message to their requirements. The humility and selflessness of this action gave his wife much joy, as she herself told me. For over two years the Canon nobly carried out this self-imposed task, giving simple little ten minute addresses in the Union Chapel and visiting the sick and others. One poor young woman who was threatened with blindness, and suffered from chronic asthma, greatly appreciated his Sunday morning and week-day afternoon visits, and through his interesting me in her case, we were able to provide her with G.F.S. friends to visit her and teach her braille.

In 1913, when Canon Glazebrook felt his task at the Union was done, and had better be handed over to another, he persuaded the Guardians, without much difficulty, to appoint a salaried Chaplain once more.

Another instance of the Canon's readiness to help in difficulties may be mentioned. During the war, when the staff of the King's School was depleted, he undertook to coach some of the elder boys privately for their examinations, in his own study. I only hope those boys duly appreciated their great privilege . Some of the happiest hours of my own life were spent in that study, when between breakfast and Mattins, in 1906 and 1907, Canon Glazebrook and I together studied Hebrew in preparation for our class at Canon Kennett's, and later on—1907 to 1909—compared the various critical texts of Isaiah, so that the Canon might give as perfect a version as possible in his *Studies in the Book of Isaiah.'*

If these few reminiscences have served to cast light upon the less known aspects of the character of one whom we all revere, I shall, indeed, be happy. One further remark I would venture. He told me himself that he had always had to fight against a great natural shyness, and that is the explanation of much of the apparent stiffness and reserve which, to many, made him more or less unapproachable.

K. M. Emery.

THE FALL OF MAN.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

Sir,

What Mr. Ernest Thomas calls 'the patently untenable dogma of the Fall of Man' has seemed to me for more than fifty years an obvious fact of Natural History. Having rather hastily concluded, while still a schoolboy, that biological evolution was an established fact, I was afterwards compelled to compare this with the doctrine of the Fall, and I saw at once that the event so described by theologians was a necessary consequence of what I believed about the origin of the human species. For man's remote ancestors, like the anthropoid apes which appear to be his nearest kindred, must have been in the state of Original Righteousness on which theologians insisted; for they had not yet arrived at a faculty of volition suffi-

ciently developed to make them capable of sinning. At some stage after the attainment of that faculty there must obviously have been a first sin, which was evidently what my theological instructors meant by the Fall. And further, since it was quite evident that *homo sapiens* had not only a capacity for sinning but also a deplorable tendency to sin—as a line of Ovid and my own experience jointly testified—it seemed at least highly probable that the original sinners had in some unexplained way transmitted that tendency to their offspring. This I gathered to be the meaning of Original Sin. I am no longer as sure as I then was that the hypothesis of evolution will account for all the known facts on which it bears, but I still think that it is so far valid.

Mr. Thomas adds some words about the meaning of which I am in doubt—'in all its literalness.' Is this a reference to the facts of Natural History mentioned above? If so, I have nothing more to say. But a doubt assails me whether he may not have in mind the strange notion that belief in the Fall is derived from a literal reading of the third chapter of *Genesis*. If so, I will venture to ask from what was the third chapter of *Genesis* derived. From ancient Sumerian legends, it may be answered. But that does not give us the writer's motive. Of this there can hardly be a doubt: he believed in the Fall, and tried to explain what he believed in a dramatic form with a free use of those ancient legends. So the third chapter of *Genesis* was derived from a belief in the Fall, without which it would not have been written. How, then, can the belief be derived from it? If A is derived from B, can B be derived from A? It seems nonsense.

Whence, then, came the belief? Let us frankly confess that we do not know. We can verify it on the lines of the evolutionary hypothesis; but that can hardly have been its origin, unless some Hebrew prophet or some other seer had, like St. Augustine, a glimmering view of the possibility of the development of higher animals from lower forms of life.

T. A. Lacey.

The College, Worcester.
April 23rd, 1926.

[We would venture to supplement Canon Lacey's letter.

(1) *Genesis III* was written to explain the origin of many curious, disconcerting and painful things in the ancient Oriental world in which this myth originated. These things are the subject condition of married women, the pangs of child-birth, the peculiar gait and diet of the serpent, the origin of clothes, the ineradicable character of thorns and thistles, the heavy toil of agriculture and, above all, the reign of death. All these were regarded by the Jahwist author of *Genesis III* as due to some primal act of disobedience to a Divine Command which had brought upon the world a Divine Curse. This teaching of *Genesis III* would to-day be contradicted by all our biologists and anthropologists, although St. Paul's teaching and our traditional Christian theology assume its truth.

(2) There is no evidence that primitive men ever existed in a state of original righteousness, which is a state in which one knows right from wrong, acknowledges the obligation to do right, and conducts oneself accordingly. The condition of primitive man may more properly be described as aboriginal innocence. This condition man leaves behind as the result of a growing experience. The term Fall—like the term Miracle—although still retained by Christian teachers, has lost its old meaning, and there is much to be said for dropping it. Where it can be treated in a book with the title *Falling Upwards*, which we have on our shelves, a *reductio ad absurdum* has been reached.—Ed., M.C.]

ANGLO-CATHOLICISM AND THE CHURCH.

SIR, To the Editor of the *Modern Churchman*.

I cannot in a letter deal as I should wish with all the points of Mr. Bezzant's friendly criticism, but I will deal with those which he regards, I think, as most important.

First, as to the continuity of the Church. That the Christian Church is the Israel of God, and continues the life of the Jewish, is presupposed in every great type of New Testament teaching (cf. e.g. *Rom.* xi, 16-18; I *Pet.* ii, 9, 10; *Rev.* xii, 1, 2, 13 ff.). The members of the Apostolic Church, whether Jews or Gentiles, look back to the saints of the Old Testament as their 'fathers,' and claim all the promises of the Old Testament for themselves. Indeed, neither St. Paul nor the seer of the Apocalypse will allow that Jews who have rejected their Messiah are any longer Jews (*Rom.* ii, 28, 29; *Phil.* iii, 2, 3; *Rev.* ii, 9). I need not labour this, as, since Dr. Hort pointed it out, it has become more or less a commonplace of New Testament interpretation. But of course it is not enough to say this; Mr. Bezzant is not alone in finding the New Testament view lacking in historical reality. Let me try to explain what, as I see it, the Biblical view of the Church is.

Now the question turns upon the relation of ideals to the concrete realities which embody them. First, there may be an ideal, which is but, as Mr. Bezzant says, a type laid up in heaven; it has found no embodiment as yet. Secondly, there may be an ideal so admirably embodied in nature or in art that we do not think of the ideal as to be distinguished from the reality. We do not, *e.g.*, contrast the primroses in Bagley Wood with the ideal primrose, or a Raleigh bicycle with the ideal bicycle. But there is a third possible relation of the ideal to the reality beside the negative one and the one just described; and, in relation to the Church, Modernists of Mr. Bezzant's school seem continually to forget it. The ideal may be, so to say, immanent in the concrete reality destined to embody it, though far from being as yet fully embodied in fact. Even in low forms of life the changes which take place do not seem to be explicable apart from this immanent urge to become what they are not yet, and we do not understand the organism unless we understand something of its goal. So it is *a fortiori* with realities of a higher kind, with nations and with individual men. The purpose which God has for each of them is not just a type laid up in heaven; the ideal is immanent in the concrete reality which it is striving to fashion. In this sense, as well as in Kipling's,

'What should they know of England who only England know?'

If we can see in England nothing but a seething-pot of class warfare, we do not know England at all.

Now so it is with the Church—with that 'elect race, royal priesthood, holy nation, people for God's own possession'—in which St. Peter, like all Catholics, so profoundly believed. God's purpose was immanent even in its humble beginnings before the dawn of authentic history, but we cannot there yet discern His purpose. As, however, the brain and heart of the organism are formed, the Church begins in its noblest members to be conscious of its destiny, and to see that it is higher than it has known. But Mr. Bezzant seems to ignore this altogether. 'The existing Jewish Church,' he says, was in our Lord's day 'what it always had been, the apotheosis of nationalism.' Exactly the same might be said of the Church of Armenia to-day. But the question is, 'Was it only that?' Certainly the Second Isaiah did not think so, or the Second Zechariah, or indeed any one of the great teachers of Israel. Israel was the servant of the Lord,

only to be understood by those who recognised its mission to the world. That the Church as a whole was blind as yet to its mission they knew very well. 'Who is blind but my servant, or deaf as my messenger that I send?' It had neither the unity, nor the holiness, nor the broad sympathy, nor the consciousness of its calling necessary for its work. But they believed both in God's purpose and in His power to accomplish it; and so, paradox as this may seem, they were willing to live and die for the actual concrete Israel that they saw, because it was God's One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. So—needless to say—it is with St. Paul. The Church, which is the Body of Christ, is the Church actual and visible; but it is that Church with God's purpose immanent within it.

But now we must consider a different question: How is this purpose possible of attainment in view of man's freedom and continual refusal rightly to respond? In two ways. The first is the gradual revelation of God's will by the prophets, and at last by the Lord; the second is the action of the divine judgments. Just in so far as the nature of the divine purpose is made clear to the members of the Church, their safety and continuance depend upon the response which they make. The Church in the days of Isaiah and Jeremiah had no thought of any missionary calling; and judgment did not fall because that calling was set aside. It fell because the Church refused the response that had been clearly asked of it, because it neither did justly, nor loved mercy, nor walked humbly with its own God. Thus vast numbers of its members were either destroyed or lost in the welter of the nations round; and God's calling passed to the new Israel of 'the remnant' that was left. That seems to be God's invariable method. The 'remnant' is never an invisible body; an invisible body is a contradiction in terms. Nor is it ever a new body; it is always part of the Church as it is before the judgment falls. The remnant is the part of the Church which remains, when God has rejected the rest. What took place when the Lord came was exactly what was to be expected. When God 'gave' His Son 'to be head over all things to the Church,' God's immediate claim, made clear by the Lord and the Apostles, was for faith in His Son and adherence to Him. When the nation as a whole rejected Him, it of course ceased to be the Church; its unbelieving members were 'cut off,' as St. Paul says, and the Lord built His Church on the faithful remnant. The followers of the Lord did not at first join the Church by believing in the Lord; still less did they make the Church; but faith in the Lord was the indispensable condition of their continuance in it in the first instance, and of their return to it when the nation had been rejected.

It will now, I hope, be clear what Catholics mean by the Church. It is never 'a nebulous something'; it is as concrete and visible as the dome of St. Paul's. But just because, being composed of men and women, it never fully responds to its divine purpose, never *e.g.* has the unity or holiness that it ought to have, it is always possible to ignore the divine purpose immanent within it, and speak of it, as Mr. Bezzant speaks of it under its pre-Christian form. It is precisely for this reason that the belief in the Church which we express in the Creed possesses moral and spiritual value. That there are scattered all over the world a number of people whose religion or morality has some connection with Jesus of Nazareth is not a matter of faith, but a matter of fact. To *believe* in the Church is to believe in it as an 'elect race' which has a life continuous through the ages, and upon which the fulfilment of God's purpose is resting. What precisely are the conditions upon which its continuity depends, and what is the comparative importance of one and another, are further questions far too complex for discussion here.

And now for that Catholic appeal to the Church, which seems to Mr. Bezzant so futile and unreal. It has always been made; it has always been open to exactly the same objections as those which he urges; and it has always been, in those competent to make it, full of illumination and a great source of unity one with another. Suppose that in one of the ages immediately preceding the coming of the Lord an enlightened Jew had desired to believe, and live, and worship according to the mind of God. Would he have done well to study impartially all the thought of his day, ethnic as well as Jewish, and out of this miscellaneous material fashion for himself the best religion that he could, and call it Modern Judaism? Or would he —it being of course presupposed that he was morally and intellectually convinced that Israel had been under the divine teaching and guidance as other nations had not been—have been justified in looking primarily for guidance to the mind of the Church? Awkward questions might no doubt have been put to him. The Church when, and the Church where? The Church of Moses, or of Samuel, or of Jeremiah, or of Simon the son of Onias? The Church in N. Israel or in S. Israel, or (in later days) in Jerusalem, or in Galilee, or at Elephantine? I think that he might have answered, as I should do, that he proposed to go by 'what in the thought and practice of the Church all down the centuries had been at once most nearly universal and most widely fruitful in good,' and that, with the great literature and history of his people before him, in all matters of importance he would have found himself in no doubt as to what that had been. And if a Jew might have said this, how much more may a Catholic, who believes that the Head of the Church has poured out upon it the Spirit of God in a measure unknown before His coming; and that, though the Spirit of God may always be resisted, and the Church fall as low as it ever fell before the Lord came, the heights of sanctity and illumination reached have been far greater than the old Israel knew! May I assure Mr. Bezzant that he is mistaken if he thinks that there are any differences among Anglo-Catholics in the least comparable to those which exist among Modernists. Differences there are, of course; and it was one of my complaints against the Call to Action that it never made clear whom it was attacking. But the differences exist exactly at the points where the appeal to the Church meets with no definite answer. Where the answer is clear, my experience is that critical and non-critical Catholics—Catholics English, Roman and Greek—agree very well indeed. It has been my duty and pleasure of late to read a good deal of the works of the French Catholic school of historical criticism, of Batiffol, and Lebreton, and Prat; and I find that almost everywhere their conclusions are identical with my own. I do not find that in the same degree when I read the writings of English Modernists, though I notice that Mr. Bezzant and I agree in some things in which he thinks that we do not.

Sincerely yours,

H. L. GOUDGE.

MODERNISTS *v.* TRADITIONALISTS.

SIR, TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Modern Churchman*.

You give one some interesting information, but the whole of my last letter—for the length of which I apologise—was meant to be a request to you to disclose your fundamental assumptions about the relation between God and Creation as frankly as I disclosed mine. Till this is done we may discuss for ever Professor Lake's book or any other, but we shall be ὡς ἀέρα δέροντες.

Let me explain. You imply that modern historical criticism 'proves' that the evidence for the physical resurrection of Christ is inadequate. I

cannot conceive that anyone would agree to this unless his view of the relation between the Creator and Creation was radically different from mine. I have studied modern criticism quite enough to be sure of that, but I wish to be still more sure by asking you to say wherein you differ from the very brief statement of assumptions which I gave as Traditionalist in my last letter. Where, in short, do your fundamental assumptions differ from ours? I have, of course, no right to speak for all Traditionalists and Modernists, and have often said they have no creed to which all would subscribe. But if we speak only for ourselves it would greatly clear the air.

This is what I call studying the psychology of the Modernists, and to this you have invited me. Fellow-Christians and fellow-priests of the Church are not justified in controverting each other about great central questions without first ascertaining as far as they can if they start from approximately the same view of the Universe and its Creator. Moreover I notice a remark on p. 45 that there is a complaint against the clergy of England for not concerning themselves 'with the ultimate questions.' That complaint is just. We are often warned in the Gospel against διαλογισμοί. Does not that mean controversy which Westcott said is always concerned with details? I am not seeking controversy, but for a comparison of the deepest assumptions which we cannot help holding; and if you are good enough to concede this request we can then cautiously proceed to certain inferences bearing on the great matters at issue. I have more hope in this effort than in sitting at anyone's feet, especially as you tell me the difficult *solvitur ambulando*. For—pardon the flippancy—whatever a Modernist may do, I cannot sit and walk at the same time.

E. LYTTELTON.

[The question Dr. Lyttelton puts is not one of 'fundamental assumptions.' In their 'fundamental assumptions' the Modernist and Traditionalist are agreed. The Christian 'fundamental assumptions' concern the character and will of God, and whether we have a supreme unveiling of that will and character in Jesus Christ. These constitute the great working hypotheses of the Christian, and they are summarised in the words of St. John in the Modernist creed published in this issue of the *Modern Churchman*.

As to the 'fundamental assumptions about the relation between God and Creation,' the Modernist and Traditionalist both agree that God is Creator of the Creation, and that He is both transcendant and immanent in relation to it. Where, however, the Modernist and Traditionalist differ is in their conception of the Divine *method* of operation in the creative process. Here, it seems to us, Dr. Lyttelton desires information on two points:

(1) Wherein does the Modernist view of the Divine method of operation differ from the Traditionalist's view of it?
(2) How is it that the Modernist arrives at this different view?

Broadly speaking, the view of the Traditionalist is that God operates instantaneously and miraculously; that of the Modernist, that God operates non-miraculously, *i.e.* through the operation of the laws of Nature, physical, biological and psychological, and that these laws are combined, the lower being subsumed in co-operation with the higher, in an evolutionary creative process. Whilst, according to the Modernist, the creative process through which God operates is ever bringing new things into existence, He does not operate 'irruptively' or without secondary causes. The *Deus ex machina* miracle is not the Modernist conception of the Divine method of operation *par excellence*.

(2) The Modernist is moved to this view because he approaches the problem not *a priori* but *a posteriori*. He believes in Bishop Butler's aphorism that we are in no sort judges beforehand of the Divine methods. Hence each case that comes up to be considered must be judged by the evidence for it. The Modernist, moreover, is strongly disposed to believe that the Scientists are the best judges of the Divine method of operation in Nature, and the Historians the best judges of the Divine method of operation in History.

In conclusion, may we venture to urge again that the best way to get to understand the Modernist psychology is not by the cross-examination of a Modernist in a magazine-correspondence, but by the patient study of Modernist methods of investigation. By this means the Traditionalist will come to realise that the reason why the Modernist's conclusions differ from his own is because the psychology of the Modernist differs as much from the psychology of the Traditionalist as does the atmosphere of a science laboratory from that of a debating society.—ED., M.C.]

AN IDEAL HYMN BOOK.

TO THE EDITOR OF *The Modern Churchman.*

SIR,

May I supplement my letter in *The Modern Churchman* for April by mentioning the *Hymnal of the Federation of Post-War Brotherhoods*, published by Messrs. A. G. Searle and Sons, Arundel Street, Portsmouth. It is a small collection of 104 hymns, many of which are taken from *The Fellowship Hymn Book*. If a hymn book could be compiled embracing the hymns in *The Fellowship Hymn Book, The Hymnal* mentioned above, *Songs of Praise* and *Spiritual Songs of Southwold Parish Church* it would be an approach to an ideal hymn book.

ARTHUR A. PEARSON.

Hillsborough, Petersfield.
26th April, 1926.

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION LONDON GATHERING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *Modern Churchman.*

SIR,

I shall be obliged if you will publish the following arrangements made for the Annual Service and Meetings of the Churchmen's Union to be held on Wednesday, June 9th.

11.30 a.m. : Holy Communion and Sermon, at St. Andrew's, Ashley Place, Westminster.

3 p.m. : Business Meeting at the Church House, Westminster. Subject for discussion, 'The Aims and Methods of the C.U.,' to be introduced by Dr. Douglas White.

8 p.m. : *PUBLIC MEETING* at the Caxton Hall, Westminster. Subject, 'Truth as the Basis of Religion.'

CHAIRMAN : Sir Lawrence Jones, Bart.
SPEAKERS : The Dean of St. Paul's.
Sir Oliver Lodge.
Dr. J. G. Adami (Vice-Chancellor of Liverpool University).
Canon C. S. Woodward of Westminster Abbey.

JOHN. H. BENTLEY,
Org. Secretary.